



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

A
Quarterly Review.

VOL. XXIII.
JANUARY—JUNE.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 200, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1852.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1852.

ART. I. — *Memoir of Edward Copleston, D.D. Bishop of Llandaff.* By WILLIAM JAMES COPLESTON, M. A. &c.
London: John W. Parker. 1851.

THE name of Copleston, both from the well-earned personal reputation of the late Bishop of Llandaff, and also from many associations connected with the principal scene of his active life, as Provost of Oriel College, will ever meet with respect and honour from those who are acquainted with the literary, religious, or academic world of the last sixty years. We say this advisedly, though conscious of many differences of opinion which would naturally prohibit him from occupying a very important niche in the hero calendar of this Review. In a fair and open discussion of principles and parties during so long a period of time as Dr. Copleston was an active member of society, it is bad taste, and not at all to the point, to make any matters of disagreement subjects of personal disparagement, especially with regard to one who had much liberality and candour of mind, and in whom anything which may have appeared to the contrary may justly be ascribed to the physical temperament of declining years rather than to a moral fault of the vigorous mind. Dr. Copleston always maintained the character of a gentleman, which is no matter of course in the various positions of life in which he was placed, and he therefore merits *gentle* treatment in return; but if another argument were wanting to the reviewer of his Memoirs, all severity of criticism is entirely disarmed by the unassuming modesty and high-bred feeling of what is due to all parties concerned, in which the nephew has drawn up the uncle's life for the perusal of the public. There is an honourable wish to give a tribute of respect to an uncle, and there is also an ever-present anxiety not to be wearisome or obtrusive of individual feelings. There is throughout the volume an affectionate wish to give Dr. Copleston his well-earned place in public esteem, and yet to avoid any party-spirited means of accomplishing this end. A loving and grateful tribute to the memory of the dead is shown to be not incompatible with independence of sentiment on the part of the living.

NO. LXXV.—N.S.

B

155187

A few of the landmarks of biography are even to comprehend the most general idea of character. Dr. Copleston was son of a Devorator of Offwell. He was born 1776, educated till the age of fifteen, when he was elected Christi College. It is remarked that his early records of unusual precocity. A good secured undoubtedly was when he left the paternal tained various undergraduate prizes, and in fellow of that college, with which his name is stated. In two years he became Tutor, and was in 1814, an office which he held to the great till in 1827 he was raised to the episcopal that year to his death, in 1849, he divided his dence at the deanery of St. Paul's and the diocese.

Dr. Copleston entered life in an academical ship was almost the only standard of excellence with the exception of conversational powers, what convivial habits of the day might have infused into them. Theology was sunk in as being no longer a subject on which the human much puzzle itself. A quiet and decorous elements of the Christian religion was all ambitious minds thought it necessary to aim this the science of theology was thought to with religion; and the general style of conversation made it desirable, for the sake of reverence, should not be introduced as subjects of social of a physical kind was but just dawning on the men, and had hardly penetrated into the common-room talk. Oxford thought herself and bred up many true friends, many lovely ideal alone, who in better times would have been to take a higher ground of affection. Men do what the spirit is which really attracts the which they love. Men loved, as they thought devotion, the classic groves of *Alma Mater*, they would have been little won by equally equally polished society, under less consecrated Oxford involuntarily carries with it, by its nature even through generations of apathy.

May we picture to ourselves the better kind half a century back, when Copleston was Tutor universal favourite, both from the reputations labours and his powers of conversation? These

his case, conscientiously discharged, under two prevailing ideas, the scholar and the gentleman. He enlarged on the beauties of classic writers, and attracted his pupils by his earnest and sincere devotion to literature; while, at the same time, he never omitted to make refinement of manners a natural result of true literary culture. He had strength and vigour of mind to break loose from conventional modes of what is called *discharging his duty*, and brought in zeal and common sense (for the latter of these is oftener the result of the former than some imagine) to impart true and living interest to his work. The scantiness of subject on which he laboured was the fault of his age, though at the same time he profited personally by this fault, for his peculiar turn of mind found thereby a field for distinction perhaps more free from competitors than a more extended age of intellectual cultivation would have allowed him. Mr. Copleston's mode of criticism as a lecturer is described, by one who was his pupil, as follows:—

“Another encouraging circumstance in Mr. Copleston's mode of tuition, was his utter contempt of anything in the shape of pedantry and mystification, and his leaning to the rationalist school of commentators, such as Brunck, Heynè, and Schütz. His habit was to treat nonsense as nonsense; and his familiarity with the thought and idioms of the ancients, while it supplied the best possible criterion for the adoption or rejection of an ingenious guess, fully convinced him that the Greeks wrote nothing definable under that predicament.” —P. 32.

His success in imparting an honourable feeling to his pupils is testified by the following passage from the same witness:—

“A successful evasion of the discipline maintained by Mr. Copleston was considered as no great matter of good taste or triumphant ingenuity, and the sympathy felt for those who had come into unpleasant collision with him, was usually of the nature of what you or I should feel for a friend passing through the process of the Insolvent Court, or sued for ‘breach of promise’ before an impartial judge. Conservatism (if I may so term it) was rather the fashion among our best-bred and best-connected men, whether studious or not; anything of the sort of social bravado which the youngsters call ‘slang’ and ‘swell,’ was at as decided a discount as in a Pall-Mall club-house now-a-days; and though I do not know that the college was in my time more moral or religious than other well-regulated ones, it was more free from the troublesome follies and petulancy of school-boy society than most others. A Newmarket coat, or a remarkable waistcoat, would have been extinguished in the birth by the unmerciful sarcasms of our dictators in dress; and if a man was in any way tempted to do wrong in more serious matters, it was rather for his own pleasure than from any zest of defying authority.

“All this I am apt to trace in some degree to the moral influence of an accomplished and strong-minded man like Mr. Copleston.

“I may truly say that I never knew any professed man of letters from whom I heard, in the way of familiar conversation, such sound and discreet maxims as to that art of society in which Parr and Porson certainly were novices, and those business-like habits which qualify a man to take care of

"Now, look there—as if that man, who ought to know I called here half-a-dozen times, could not recollect that my nation, as you may see it over my door, and that I was baptised, which he must know also, or might have found out.

"C.—Yes—the Rev. Mr. Coppleson! Now *I cannot* recollect to a young man, like yourself, entering the world in good faith, and without having ascertained the exact prefix, spelling, and pronunciation of every name with whom you have intercourse: such, I mean, as he and his family have adopted. Depend upon it, that people in general infer a sort of moral laxity, or such lapses; as if you took so little interest in their identity, and in the minor characteristics of it."—Pp. 33—35.

room. Natural religion is the basis on which revelation loves to rest, and from which alone the Christian temple rises up in its full beauty of its legitimate decorations.

If such as we have described was the work of the University viewed through its most favoured examples and efforts, then an aspect of its recreations and social life which cannot be passed over, for it betrays that a very imperfect standard of moral strictness was enabled to be set up by a state of society which made the gentlemanly character too primary and so required a consideration. For the first fifteen years that Copleston was Fellow of Oriel, the common-rooms of Oxford shared favour much in the *bon vivant* spirit of the age. Dining in hall at four o'clock, the remainder of the evening was devoted, among scholars and literary men, to a freedom of what was in, and also of what comes out of, the mouth, which was common to country clergymen, who had once been Fellows of the colleges, but were fairly established at their livings in the ways of life, rather shy of rejoining their old companions. Those who know the habits of modern common-rooms, will find it a great contrast for port wine to be consumed at the end of a bottle a-head, besides warmer potations, with hot supper. Mr. Copleston's society was much sought after as an agreeable addition to the more intellectual of the social evenings, and no doubt, the tone of conversation was raised where he was present, but that he did not make it a more prominent part of his attempts at academic reformation, to discountenance, by precept and example, the self-indulgent habits around him, is to be regretted. We can almost fancy that a consciousness of not having done what he might have done in this respect having let this vital point of any active reformation escape his region of influence, and then his seeing another school almost from his own offspring, which did what he had neglected, may have added to that constitutional melancholy so conspicuous in his later years; for he cannot but have felt, though he started in life as an infuser of new blood into his generation, yet still, in some respects, he represented rather than the new school. He had left a certain high moral out of his system at the first start of life, and was never able to and even became physically incapacitated, to nerve up his resolution to be the advocate of that severity of manners and disinterested self-devotion which graced the teaching of his predecessors in academic life. There have been some, for instance, within the walls of Oriel, in whose diary we would have expected to meet the following self-complacent remarks on worldly prosperity:—

“*Jan. 1.* On the 1st January, in the year 1800, I assessed, after all demands, of 21*l.* Upon making a similar after an interval of twenty-one years, I reckon my whole furniture, plate, books, wine, pictures, &c.) at not less than *trust* that there has been no sordid saving; and I am sensible of a great deal of useless and injudicious expenditure. Sobered, according to this measure of worldly success. most in the advantages I have enjoyed is, that my time has been as much at my own disposal, and as much directed to a liberal and interesting nature, as if I had never given up the acquisition of wealth. It has flowed in upon me with my part: and even the intellectual labour out of which I am conscious, much less than is ordinarily undergone I have been. Three-fourths of my reading has been chosen on its own account.”—P. 96.

Dr. Copleston's love of high society and interest in its elegancies, we are not much disposed to censure; for he merited whatever of such honours he enjoyed. As a benefactor to the cause of gentleman-like education, over, he never lost his habitual self-respect. He did not arts to gain preferment; nor did his love of society go beyond the legitimate ground of those among whom he who were patrons of literature. His interest in Lord Grenville was throughout that of the greatest friendship and friendship, and was far superior to any feeling from one to the other. An account of a visit to him in January of 1814, with an adventurous journey, we give in his own words, taken from a letter

“My visit to Dropmore was not prevented by the storm there on the 18th, the day on which the great fall of the price of the kingdom. From the time I entered the house there was no possibility of going outside the door without trouble; and, in fact, I did not stir out once. There was an agreeable fire in the house very warm, containing every luxury that I could wish for, and, what with billiards and books, the time was filled up as one could desire.

“Lord Grenville I have always found friendly and cheerful, very unassuming, and though not affable, from his conversation, yet conversing with frankness and simplicity, and reason to place confidence. Not much discussion occurred, as you may suppose, but there seemed to be no difference of opinion on the bullion question we had one night a long conversation, all parties fortunately were agreed. It seems that I had just published a pamphlet, in which he recommended a standard of our coinage to a level with the depreciation of the present rents cannot be maintained, thus *perpetua* the proprietor and annuitant that loss, which he has borne patiently under the idea that it is temporary and soon to be restored.”

“Lord Grenville sent me in his carriage to Maidenhead, where no chaise was to be had, and I was obliged to take a coach. It was the first day after an interval of four days that I travelled; and such was the state of the roads, that

Memoir of Bishop Copleston.

and much peril we reached Benson that night, twelve miles short of Oxford. Once we were upset—completely—all the outside passengers, seven in number, tossed over the hedge, happily into a deep bed of snow, and the slightest injury done to any one. But as the dusk came on, our journey was most hazardous; the people on horseback whom we met answered anxious inquiries of the coachman by advising him not to proceed; the day was near its close, and it seemed too late to return. We were then, six miles from Benson, obliged to leave the road, and drive over ploughed fields for at least five miles, often full gallop, for fear of being benighted. The coachman declared he knew nothing of the way, and was guided only by a coach before us. Once, owing to some accident in the harness, we were obliged to stop, lost sight of our leader, and the man claimed—'We are lost!' Upon our talking of walking, he strongly dissuaded it, and I believe with good reason; for it is impossible, with experience, to conceive the change in the whole aspect of the country, especially after daylight—the cold in the meantime intense, and the snow so deep, that we could not have advanced two miles on foot from mere fatigue.—This, I believe, is the immediate cause of fatal accidents in snow. Persons are soon exhausted who attempt to walk: they lie down, and never rise again. Under all these circumstances we at length reached Benson about 6 P. M., chiefly in consequence of having fetched up our vehicle by a gallop till we got in sight of the leading coach, and that overgrown which might or might not be passable for a coach—no one knew.

"We came on next morning to Oxford—a procession of six coaches having traversed the fields again about four miles, and passed a flock of wild geese feeding, which took no notice of us, so severe was the weather. So ends my winter campaign, and I feel happy in the consciousness that nothing need draw me from home till the weather is more favourable. I am much afraid the extreme severity of this winter has affected the comfort of the poor, and shortened the lives of many. The cheapness of bread is an alleviation; but the want of fuel is almost irremediable."—Pp. 47—

With reference to another aristocratic acquaintance, I extract a passage from a letter, written in 1823, which contains an interesting allusion to one member of a noble family, who was now much changed from the course which then seemed to be marked out for him:—

"Last night I returned from Althorp, a house I always visit with pleasure, as one of the best specimens of domestic life, on a grand scale, that can be imagined. George Spencer, the youngest son, has been curate of the parish for a year, and is to have the living when it becomes vacant. He would, I think, satisfy you. I never heard the service better performed, or a more simple, earnest, and affectionate style of preaching than at Lyttelton, in talking over his character to me, was affected even to tears, having, as he observed, feelings rather paternal than fraternal towards him. What an interesting picture of life it is, to see a family of that rank and splendour connected with their neighbourhood by all the most sacred and endearing ties, as well as by those which wealth and power naturally create."—Pp. 94, 95.

Of Mr. Copleston's early literary productions it is unnecessary to say that they were polished well-written treatises. His 'Praelectiones,' or his lectures delivered in Latin, as Professor of Poetry, acquired great fame for their author. His articles in defence of the University were vigorous and well-timed.

His contributions to the 'Quarterly' were part of a high standard of reviewing than that periodical at present sue in laying before the public. Copleston's influence, however, was the result of his writings; they were only an adjunct to his literary character, not the foundation of it. As an active and leading member of the University, it is obvious that he must defend it by writing, when need was, as well as by personal management, if he would maintain the reputation he had acquired, and was ambitious of increasing. He was not, in fact, an author, but he only used a certain clearness of expressing himself on paper, to assist in the general order of his life. Dr. Copleston did not neglect the essential part of a literary man's life which foreign travel occupies. The letters which he wrote from the Continent, some of which are given in his *Memoirs*, are those of a clear-headed, impartial, and observant traveller. It was natural to him, in the vigour of youth, especially under the excitement of fresh scenes, and the freedom from home trammels, to show much independence of vulgar prejudice, an active appreciation of good customs and habits, though foreign to his own previous associations, and much liberality of mind in touching upon many subjects of religious controversy which usually are a stumbling-block to travellers—we mean notices of Romish ceremonial and practice. Obtuseness of vision was not Copleston's failing; yet there was a sad inability to break through the formal routine of official life, in the practical execution of his various powers—an inability which, from being at first only excused, became at last his adopted principle of action. Better hopes, for instance, might have been entertained than were afterwards realized, if we consider the following remarks as coming from one who was to be Dean of St. Paul.

"In Italy there is still a great spirit of devotion in their own way. One of the most striking peculiarities was the numerous paintings of saintly martyrs, in frescoes, by the roadside, and against houses in every village we passed through. Their climate admits of this exposure, and the elevation is far superior to what would be seen in country places in any other part of the world. The churches, too, which are in 'catholic' countries open all day long, were never without people kneeling in profound devotion. One custom they have, which might well be imitated by Protestants, of repairing to church to say their private prayers. Many people in particular will turn in for this purpose, and stay a few minutes on their knees, when any service is going on or not."—Pp. 58, 59.

There is something almost melancholy and depressing in the barren unpractical speculations, when the writer of them more than twenty years presided over the dreary walls of the interior of that cathedral, without any attempt to give it a Christian life, or even artistic warmth; and never heeded popular outcry to open its doors without the payment of an invidious twopence.

The Monastic system meets with its usual condemnation in his hands, as testified by his remarks on Chartreuse; his previous admiration, however, of the material part of this institution is interesting in itself, and shows his appreciation of a We therefore give our readers the result of both what he saw and what he thought:—

“It is always described as the richest church in point of decoration perhaps, in the world. Taking into account the beauty of the works of art, and the costliness of the materials which *compose*, rather than adorn it does, I believe, deserve that character. We were perfectly confounded with the prodigious display of exquisite sculpture, and rich inlaid work in marble and precious stone. Wreaths of flowers, birds, and other ornamental devices, are represented in native colours by pieces of marble, of every species of stone which the lapidaries use. The size, the beauty, the variety and the endless profusion of these materials, added to the grandeur and elegance with which the work is executed, deserve all that has been said, or can be said, in its praise. Some of the finest pictures have been taken by the French to enrich the Louvre, but they have abstained from pillaging the wealth which encrusts all the shrines and walls of the church. The large monastery to which it was attached, like all other establishments of the kind within the reach of French influence, has been suppressed, but the building still remains unoccupied, except by two monks, who attend to the service of the church. The foundation was of the most munificent kind. The apartments allotted to each monk were equal to a small house with a garden and servants' rooms. I own that among the acts of the French in their conquered countries, this one of the suppression of monasteries always gave me pleasure. The institution is so burdensome and injurious, and yet so interwoven with the law and the religion of a country that one can never hope to see it eradicated by regular means. It may be either a robber or a tyrant, or both, like our Henry, to do it. They talk of restoring religious orders again in Italy; but whatever they do believe the world is secure against the endowment of wealthy religious houses again.”—Pp. 57, 58.

If such, however, were Dr. Copleston's abstract views on the political bearing of monasteries, he was not uncourteous or ungrateful for the attention and hospitality he received from these institutions, or blind to personal virtues even in a monk. After visiting St. Bernard, he writes:—

“Our wishes have been gratified to the utmost; the day has been almost without a cloud. We arrived in good time for the evening reception. There were three other strangers besides ourselves who supped with the *pères*. It has been as pleasant an evening as I ever passed. The priest who entered most into conversation, is just what a monk ought to be, that is, just the opposite of what they are represented to be in all books—m well-bred, well acquainted with what is going on in the world, and, though very temperate himself, pressing his hospitality as far as decorum would allow. The younger monks give the most cheerful and kind attendance. When one considers in what a savage solitude all this scene is passing, can hardly fancy it real. But the cold, which is bitter, now that I am retired to my bedroom, forcibly reminds me of my actual existence in this spot, of which I have often read, but which, till lately, I never dreamed of seeing.”—P. 53.

His comments on the religion of the Continent we close with the following letter, in which we again notice some discrepancy between the brighter and truer fancies of the one and the dull perseverance with which he subsequently aimed at perpetuating a worn-out system, rather than in reviving an active life:—

“In Flanders, everything wears the appearance of strict attachment to the Roman Catholic worship. The churches are open in summer from the morning till noon, during which time a succession of priests officiating, the people coming and going, seldom less than thirty church at any one time, with great appearance of devotion. In the streets are often seen religious processions, figures of Christ and of the Virgin Mary, and long lines of people, well marshalled, women and children carrying candles respectively, all singing, with books in their hands, and wearing an appearance of sincere and serious piety. This proceeding took me by surprise. I was not aware that the people took so warm a part in the performance of religious offices, it being one of the commonest objections to popery that it leaves all to the priests, while the people are merely passive. At Mayence I certainly saw a parochial procession, consisting of nearly a congregation of a parish, singing lustily, and with as much pertinacity as at a Methodist meeting. As you advance towards the Rhine, however, there is a greater mixture of Protestants, who are of two classes, the Lutherans by far the most numerous, and the Reformed, as they are called, *katholisch* or Calvinists. These last, originating in Geneva and France, are numerous on the side of Germany. Formerly there existed strong jealousy and opposition between the two classes, which have now generally subsided; the Calvinists, being the less numerous, are inclined to yield, and at Mayence they have even formed a coalition *very recently*, so that they use the same church, have the same minister, and partake of the communion together. The minister using the gospel-words, ‘This is my body,’ each communicant understanding them in his own way.

“In all the places of worship I have attended (except one, which I do not speak of presently), I must say that there was greater appearance of devotion than the English church ordinarily presents. The people seemed to make it more their own business. They come before the service begins. Many sit there an hour with their books, and seem to be engaged in private prayer. I confess I cannot understand the ground upon which the English boast themselves to be a peculiarly religious people. To be sure, on the Continent Sunday is regarded as a festival, and all sorts of innocent amusements go on in the evening, after divine service is over. This is the case as much in Protestant as in Catholic countries, and I believe Heylin, in his *Treatise on the Sabbath*, is right in saying that the day was never, in the history of the church, considered as profaned by the practice, till about the latter end of our Elizabeth’s reign, when the Puritan notions began to prevail. The place of worship I meant to speak of, is the Jews’ synagogue at Amsterdam.”—Pp. 77—79.

It is only in scattered fragments of the Memoirs that we are able to gather traces of Dr. Copleston’s practical views on Church matters; we suspect, indeed, that he had no very definite principles in which conviction of the heart and mind were combined with strength of resolution in practice. He had a conscientious desire to do his duty, but as he had not started in life with an ecclesiastical or even theological idea dominant in his mind, so he never felt quite at home in adopting one, and even betrayed

some little impatience at the assumption of a higher station on the part of others than was natural to himself. He was much disposed to give up an ideal aim, and to strive for a certain blending of theory and practice, which is occasionally asserted to be the attribute of a practical man. This philosophy of moderation we must beg leave to call in question, on general grounds. The world owes its best features of character to the greatest men, its truest wisdom, its noblest actions, its deepest philosophy, its loveliest poetry, its chief moral excellence to the zealous carrying out of individual theories and spontaneously arising in the human mind. If individuals, by their own gifts, whatever they may be, even though, by comparison with the mass, they may appear eccentric in their development, the seeds or small trickling fountain, that give new life and fresh purity to the growth of the human mind, the waters of life, are, we conceive, thereby withdrawn. The standard of vigorous power is lowered in the general mind without that stimulant of genius in its ideal form, which I suppose, in many ways, raises up. If every one follows the standard of every one else, a certain and rapid deterioration is the consequence. Human society can no more live on its own fat; extraneous nourishment, occasional stimulus, as the wants of a physical constitution, apply to the necessities of man in a social aspect. Moderation of mind, as brought in opposition to anything ideal, is very different to that principle of common sense which consists, not in smothering individual powers, but in their guidance and direction. We must all, remember, in a practical way, that religion itself is a thing, so far as it holds out for our example ideal virtues and ideal types of character. Any attempt, therefore, to weaken the force of abstract virtues, to depreciate ideal examples, is in question the use of theoretical excellence, practically misapplied against the scheme of revelation. On the point, for instance of Christian charity, it may be somewhat difficult to have the enjoyment of ordinary comforts with the existence of suffering around us; but it is obviously no true solution to give up a certain ideal of entire self-devotion to the care of the poor, which our Lord Himself pictures. The following passage from a letter to Dr. Whately, written 1824, is rather into this question; and we cannot but observe, that the appeal which is brought in to Holy Writ, that the parallel of counsel we refer to is omitted, while rather a slight reference to the Divine example is introduced in its place. The tendency of such a mode of speaking is to make what is technically called a counsel of perfection a *reductio ad absurdum*.

"I can easily enter into the feelings you describe, which impel to exertions beyond her strength; but after so severe a lesson, a sense of duty must be satisfied in permitting many things to go on to, which, if the means were in our hands, we should be glad to prevent. It seems absurd to mount to metaphysical principles for a guidance in common familiar concerns of life. Yet I have frequently been led on the wide prevalence of evil in the world, as a proof that God expects us to harass ourselves incessantly in resisting it. He doubts not of our ability to do it, as affording an arena for our energies, directed as they are in obedience to his will. But it could never be meant that our duty is to be nullified by it.

"These reflections used to occur to my mind when engaged in my duties as a college officer; and it often appeared to me the more a question, with what degree of evil existing under one's eyes, it was fairly to indulge a feeling of complacency, and a desire for repose or repose. No one will say that these feelings are not to be indulged at all degrees of evil exists around us which we may by possibility. Our Saviour himself was not always teaching or relieving distress, much both of moral and physical evil he must have witnessed interfering to correct it.

"Whenever, therefore, a service of this kind exceeds the measure of health or spirits, we ought to be satisfied that another duty was required from it, and endeavour to forget, by diversion to other objects, the exertions and blemishes which are inseparable from earthly things.

"It is seldom, indeed, that one has occasion to inculcate duty, but the best motives require a moderating hand; even the most itself may grow up into asceticism."—Pp. 99, 100.

Asceticism in religion, to put it only on the practical side, is surely as true an element in stimulating the mass of the people in raising the average standard of self-denial, as that kind of devotion which we see every day to any secular object which gains influence. Every cause, true or false, which has ground, must have special devotees, and can never be sustained by that one-sided view of the expression, common sense, which bids an individual to adopt any other line than what his discrimination sees to the bottom of. No one, indeed, is alive to the danger of going down the stream than Dr. Copleston in matters which he fairly grasped, as, for instance, the rights of the Church. The following passage illustrates

"As to the inequality of endowments, and the provision made for the dignity of the clerical order, these are matters on which the public never will be made to judge rightly. The vulgar cannot enter into the notion, and the apparent inconsistency of such principles with the Gospel, will always influence the opinion of society. The more, therefore, our Government becomes, the less likely are these things to be respected, or even to be endured. Still, I trust the desirability of them will not be promoted or countenanced by the rulers of the Church, although it may be forced upon them."—P. 158.

But the inconsistency of his practical views, from a theoretical point of view, with his real consciousness of existing evils, is shown in a letter where he says this,—'I dread all sudden and reticent measures,' and continues,—'The main thing is to do it, but, how he could supply this want without what he re-

we leave to the judgment of our readers, after knowing it is:—

“The main thing we want is a governing body, vested with power frame regulations *pro re natâ*, and to adapt them to the ever-changing circumstances of the times. The property of the church ought also more under the control of its ecclesiastical governors than it is, and should be less right of appeal to temporal courts, which are too : paralyse the discipline of the church, by protecting all civil rights of siastics with the same jealousy that they do the rights of absolute free That foolish word *freehold* ought to be banished from our establishment, would really make it a thing subservient to special uses.”—Pp. 158,

This was in a letter to Dr. Berens, to whom he would express the highest views with regard to the Church which he professed. At other times, we may observe a passive yielding to a system, without even a thought of anything higher; as he thus relates, with evident complacency, the kindly-expression of William IV., spoken to an episcopal deputation

“He adverted to the attacks now frequently made on the church invidious mention of her revenues, which *he* wished were greater in of less, and condemned those who reproached the clergy with imp their temporalities, whereas it was a duty, and deserving of commend and in any other station of life would be commended.”—P. 136.

Dr. Copleston's impatience of and severance from any of who had the Church's more energetic action in view, much increased as principles of this nature became real and were elements of public opinion. This may be illustrated by contrasting two letters, which we introduce in the words of the writer of these memoirs, rather than our own:—

“The following extracts from a letter written to myself cannot fail interest, while it must awaken very melancholy reflections. How great and how necessarily changed within a few years were the sentiments of the writer towards that remarkable and most estimable man as I remember him, whose pamphlet, recommending the creation of suffragan bishops, is here acknowledged; how kindly respectful, and almost deferential, are the bishop's expressions, recognising as he does in the author of that pamphlet a mind and intellect seldom equalled. I would ask the reader to compare this letter with one written to the Provost of Oriel in 1843, subsequently inserted.”

“Deanery, St. Paul's, March 24, 1844

“My dear William, Pray tell Newman I shall read him from his pen with interest, and that I shall feel obliged to him for his pamphlet; only let him not think me disrespectful, or unfavourable of it, or necessarily adverse to his opinions, in case I do not write on the subject. I have a great personal regard for Newman, and I hope is in some degree reciprocal; yet I can easily imagine that his opinions on matters of academical and ecclesiastical concern do not coincide. . . . Suffragan Bishops were tried after the Reformation, but the experiment was thought to have failed. In practice, it led to jealous disputes. The Suffragan Bishop of Colchester was suspended for interfering improperly with the province of the Bishop of London. Since such objections recurred, and they were discontinued early in Elizabeth's reign. . . . The idea of a *subordinate* bishop, is, indeed, hardly reconcilable with the principle of Episcopal government, and his functions would

be so satisfactory to the people as those of the s
Pp. 159, 160.

The other letter, referred to by way of co
Duncan, in writing to whom he always expr
a freedom indicative of familiar friendship:—

“ I am pleased, and I hope you are, with the
answer of the chancellor and vice-chancellor of Oxfo
rian laymen. That folly is also on the wane. When
had its run, perhaps the other purposes of life, for whi
given us, will begin to receive due attention at Oxfor
years, I understand, Oxford has exhibited a practi
Caliph Omar's maxim—‘Burn the books: if they are
our faith, they are useless; if against it, they oug
Science and literature will now, I trust, raise their
right glad to find that your tastes and occupations
sickening controversies of the day.’ ”—P. 186.

In political questions, Dr. Copleston always
the Liberal party. For many years previous to th
emancipation, he was prepared to join in that
deed, to carry out Whig policy in general, on
which came under debate during his political
many respects, a genuine Whig; he had, that is
of true liberality; but, unfortunately, he was to
action by the Whig system of oligarchical selfis
he had much that carries conviction with it; h
only to make him join with political parties n
interests we would wish to see a Bishop ad
much carried away by any exhibition of talen
even expresses his opinion, after a display of o
Brougham was a friend to the aristocracy and
appreciation of eloquence was intense, for good
faculty in which he excelled more than any oth
ing account of Lord Brougham, in the high
cannot help giving, as it accords with what ma
judges are bound to confess of that able if ece

“ Brougham's last speech on the Ashburton Tre
display of his greatest talents. Three hours and five
—no hesitation, no fault of a syllable, no defect in th
of a sentence, much less of the matter of the argumen
complicated, sometimes of vast length and amplitude
structure, rich in epithets and imagery and rhythm, a
intonations which a practised actor would give to a w
repeated part, yet not one of these sentences appear
hand. He launches boldly on the ocean, tossed and
along under the gusts of passion and imagination, yet
and never for a moment impressing you with an ide
P. 184.

The following tribute to the Bishop of Ex
read with interest, as coming from so really e
eloquence:—

“Admirable speech from the Bishop of Exeter, luminous, eloque forcible, full of matter, the arrangement masterly, the tone sometin solemn, sometimes animated, energetic and bold, the reasoning correct a vigorous. His self-possession is wonderful as is his command of langua considering that he has not the practice of a lawyer, or of a man in offi yet in these respects he surpasses them all. The Bishop of London a spoke in his best manner. He always brings out original thoughts, beari well upon the subject. His diction the readiest, and purest, and m correct of any speaker. The Bishop of Exeter carried his point, an addr to the Queen, without a division. The ministers completely beaten.”
P. 170.

The Whiggism of the Bishop of Llandaff had its exception. He was strongly infected with a species of inconsistency, whi other Whigs have only more recently adopted, and which, as party, they were free from during his life; we mean the anti-popi mania. Thus he opposed strongly the Maynooth grant, taking somewhat dry, Hanoverian line of argument. As a bishop commend his personal exertions in his diocese against the Romi Church, more than his attempts at legislative intolerance, whi at one time were so foreign to his nature, but which seem have been growing upon him.

In his diocese Dr. Copleston came out in his best charact The natural freedom of his mind seemed to develop, as bishop a rough, neglected diocese, far more than in party or politi questions. His anxiety to restore Llandaff cathedral is honourable feature of his latter years. He was zealous also the general duties of his diocese, and gained much person influence by his concern for the building and proper maintenar of churches, and also for education. In the practical manag ment of a diocese he had a beneficial notion of discipline, whi was always tempered by gentlemanly and kind consideration others. As an accomplished scholar and lover of art, he was advocate for church restoration on good principles; and as impartial judge of fair ritual interpretation, he recommend some practices the defence of which we suspect that he wot hardly have been bold enough to maintain, against his usi political friends, if he had lived a little longer; as, for instan the following:—

“August 10, 1845. Preached at Chepstow. Mr. — remained at altar, and read the prayer for the church militant after the sermon, a pt tice I wish to restore wherever there are two clergymen officiating.”
P. 192.

The particulars of his episcopal duties would not form in resting subjects for extract; we therefore pass on, after t tribute we have bestowed on this portion of his life, to a m general review of his character, as calculated to throw light religious parties of the day.

Dr. Copleston, on the whole, is a disappointing. Beginning with bright anticipations, as the infuser of life and activity into academic life, he seemed unable, as he was, to grapple with the age, and sunk at last into the object of his reforming powers in more youthful and continuance of youthful vigour through life is the genius and strength of character. To the former, he never pretended; to the latter he had some claim in the merit of Oriel; but we can hardly think that he maintained the position thus earned, in the more exalted sphere to which he was preferred. Intellectually he does not fulfil the promise of his academical success gave. He always remains a literary sample, the academical star. We mean no reflection on academical lustre. It is the glory of intelligent youth to credit of cultivated riper age. Moreover, it is really not able to expect that because a young man is a good student, got prize poems and essays, or even at last mounted a professorship, and written lectures with critical acumen and good Latin, that he should therefore show a masterly performance on the world's stage, and turn out either a great statesman, a great bishop, or a great author. No man of sense expects results as these from university distinction. But Dr. Copleston's distinction at the University did, as a matter of course, raise expectations of a high kind; and these expectations were never fulfilled. And therefore in his case the remarks which would have been superfluous in the case of others, he never rose above the reputation of an academical star. We are responsible for having raised these expectations in his instance it would, indeed, be invidious to inquire, and not pursue the point. The well-meant services of active men, especially if they are great talkers and positive ones, before now incommenced a good moderate reputation, the structure higher than its real foundation can sustain, turning it from a sound reputation of its kind, into a false one. It is needless remarking how impolitic such attentions are. The world is always sure to find out, sooner or later, what material a man is made of: and the discovery is an invidious one if it falls below what we were prepared for. At the same time, in the present instance, the responsibility does not appear to rest upon an admiring circle of friends, but to be shared, to some extent, by the object of these attentions. We could have avoided the observation, but it is forced upon us. Dr. Copleston received and inhaled this opinion of his friends and admirers about himself, with a too easy and implicit confidence. He since appears to have been visited with a suspicion which was no more than his absolute and natural due. This

would have been magnanimity indeed, had the estimate of been a true and accurate one, from an impartial quarter: as was, there was a want of caution, a too great simplicity, in unreserved appropriation of it. He takes it so for granted always, like a fact of natural history, or like gospel, or like something else which is true and indisputable, that he is, indeed, star of the day, a luminary of a very high order. He receives all compliments with that supreme gravity which is due to important truths. A solemn appreciation of himself reigns in action, diction, thought, and pen. He goes through literary society, with its interchange of polite sayings, pleasing acknowledgments of position, acts of deference, courtesies, proprieties as through a religious ceremonial; impressed with the sanctity of the scene. His friends tell him he ought to have been a bishop much sooner, and he calmly acknowledges the voice of truth, and receives the tardy tribute of justice with satisfaction kept under a dignified control. The *grande série* is prominent in Dr. Copleston. When he danced in balls as a young gentleman, he doubtless went through the steps with measured dignity, and a true sense of the importance of undertaking. He is kind, benevolent, and conscientious, upon a certain point; but he is always Dr. Copleston the distinguished, the deferred to. An air of state mingles equably and in philosophical proportion with all his expressions of himself.

We cannot, therefore, relieve Dr. Copleston of all responsibility for the disappointment which has attached to his reputation. He formed a sincere estimate of himself, but a mistaken one; and he involved the world at large in that mistake. It is a mistake which is easily made, and which easily spreads, in the case of men who really have a certain amount of talent. A man of a certain measure of ability finds himself possessed of an imposing air and carriage, a good voice, and other external graces; he finds that he can say things in a manner that tells at dinner tables, or that he rises well at a public meeting,—for these are various branches of the external deportment. What can be more tempting to such a man than to avail himself of these endowments, of which the use is so easy and so agreeable? Accordingly he assumes a character, he adopts a deportment; he is imposing, lofty, striking, or graceful, as may be: he puts himself into the influential man's mould, and produces an effect upon his circles. But the time comes when this imposing personage is cast out of the atmosphere of favouring and partial opinion in which he has lived, and has to prove his strength on the open field. It then appears what material he is made of, and the discovery is not seldom disappointing. Taken out of his genial artificial sphere, the imposing personage is unable to deal with the na-

difficulties of the rude world; he does not like being about; it is contrary to his dignity and ease, and all his conscience. He has been accustomed to move in peace, and he hates stir. If the world would but allow for due preparation,—for putting himself into a becoming and getting his best sentence ready; besides maintaining gentlemen ushers to impose silence on all malignant interruption! But the world will not. He must fight battles, and soil his own fingers. He declines this and becomes the person who *might have done* great things had had the mind: and upon this supposititious ground afterwards lives. But he *does* nothing. He is, to the eye, simply a weak, lazy, and cowardly man. A lament: for the truth is, the man really had the ability for large scale, and cope with the difficulties of public life formed him for carpet greatness, and for the smooth easy and cultivated conversation.

In plain practical duties he was conscientious. Those duties were referred to their high abstract principles, and sadly failed, for uniformly he adopted a low ground to his inmost principles of action. Our object in so doing by no means to lower the personal respect ever due to him, but rather to point out the great deficiency of real principle in certain school of divines who claim him as their parent, their collegiate father. But here we find ourselves brought to those many associations which hang round the life of Copleston's Oriel life, and which are a principal source of interest which many would take in his biography.

The many names, well known to the religious, and political world, which have, in one capacity or other, been connected with the books of Oriel College, place that college in a position to all who would trace existing parties in the Church to their origin. If we began to enumerate individuals, we should hardly know where to stop, and, in justice, we have to give publicity to some who have always sought to remain in the background. It is sufficient to our immediate object, to mention any one who was acquainted with the inner life of the religious world twenty and five-and-twenty years ago, and who, two very opposite, and now very prominent, parties in the English Church, are not the development of private opinions and every-day conversations within the walls of the common-room. The genuine leaders of public opinion in the Church, which gradually have been gaining in extent and interest from those times to these, seem all to have sprung in a marvellous way, from this college; so much so, that the members of the University would appear, all through

had considerable jealousy at this collegiate monopoly. Not that the Oriel party ever was confined to men of one college, for some of its most able and firm supporters were to be found in other common-rooms; but Oriel somehow was the fountain and centre, the head-quarters of the movement. We will not, however, anticipate events, but return to consider that other Oriel party which claims more immediate connexion with the late Provost, and which was, perhaps, in part the provocative of the subsequent movement.

That natural repugnance to mystical divinity, which we have noticed in Dr. Copleston, and which in him was but the consistent expression of an age rich in scholarship, but negligent of theology, became systematized and adopted as a philosophy by his admirers and pupils. Theology forced itself upon the attention of those students, who immediately followed the generation of Copleston; but, for a time, their studies did not lead them to an entire abandonment of the easy-going contempt of theology as a profound science, which they found among their seniors in the University. Yet there were men among them who worked, and who were guided by high moral strength and in whom, therefore, it was not indifference which prompted their line. To the honour, for instance, of Archbishop Whately, we would mention, that private family misfortune happening about the time of his first admission into the University, he was told that he must look to himself for a prospect in life. From that day he adhered to a resolution forthwith expressed, of doing his best for others as well as himself; and, before long, had the reward of materially adding to the comfort of those most dear to him. If, then, it was not indifference to theological study which made these men the opponents of mystic theology, and the Church's mystic characters, what was it? The first awakening from theological torpor was in an age of intellect-worship, in an age when the *prima facie* idea of a moving party would be to throw overboard the corruptions of man's former darkened efforts in the discovery of truth. French philosophy, in fact, was exercising a strong influence in pointing out how to reconcile a revived study of theology, with the classic complacency of existing theologians. England had gloried in physical conquest, and was absorbed in a certain spirit of self-congratulation, which rendered her scholars peculiarly subject to the secret poison of rationalism which was spreading through the Continent. Church abuses at home, or rather, a state of negligence in ecclesiastical matters which altogether altered the abnormal idea of the Church's existence, made it appear a rational absurdity that the Church could realize, in any mystic character, the aspirations of a

enlightened reasoning age. Yet she existed with that absolute certainty which pertains in this country to vested rights and the holders of property. Therefore, her existence must be made compatible with the fresh life which was thought to be illuminating the science of theology. Her physical constitution was thus absorbed as a mere instrument into a new theology, and together with this adoption it was taken for granted that the last remnants of mediæval independence, which even the letter of the law might sanction, were absolutely extinct. That school of theology made no attempts to reform the Church, but it rather fixed its abuses by adopting them, and then brought forward the state of bondage, which itself had encouraged, as evidence against the practicability of her ideal system. Men of this school would say, if any one ventured to speak of the spiritual powers of the Church; 'It is all very fine, very pretty in theory; you are taken with the poetry of an imagined picture: I admire you, my dear fellow, for encouraging in your mind such refined subjects of contemplation, such elegant topics of thought; but it won't do in practice, I assure you; we live in a hard-working, matter-of-fact age, and must not lag behind its rational powers of intellect. If I had not the liking for you, and respect for your mental abilities which I have, I would be too glad to leave you in such harmless follies; but you are too clever, too useful a man, to be thus occupied in what cannot touch the business of life. Be practical then, appeal to your own common sense, and I shall soon hear that you have renounced your poetic Church.'

The method and consistency thus given to existing abuses of the Church by a party supposed to be a new life infused into her, would naturally attract favourable attention in the political world. The evangelical school was not captivating in those days to statesmen; it was methodistical, incoherent, unphilosophical and untractable; it did not fit on very well to the formalized discipline of an establishment. A religious aspect, a philosophical Churchmanship, was wanted at head-quarters, which might satisfy the religious spirit of the age, and even reflect credit on government, without inconveniencing the proprieties and exigencies, or even the apparent anomalies of a state religion. Dissenters were also noisy about their grievances, and those ecclesiastics were thought most convenient for statesmen to work with, who were philosophical enough to be prepared for any measures of concession, which might at any time seem expedient, or were even known beforehand as volunteers in proposing very summary treatment towards the Church.

There was a time when the prospects of the Church seemed, indeed, very bad to those who viewed her in any other light

than as an institution begotten in the middle ages, pruned of its superfluous wealth and arrogance at the Reformation, and thoroughly tamed to the purposes of the existing government under the Hanoverian dynasty. There is a despondency which is hard to bear up against, when you have looked for support from a particular quarter, and find only a foe. The original weakness seems thereby to be proved irremediable. It was then said, 'The Church is in danger,' to which our liberal friend already quoted, would reply, 'If in danger, then her tactics must change; she must conciliate the world. How can a few Fellows of colleges, or country parsons, hold out their ill-digested fancies against the indomitable spirit of the age, and (more to the purpose) against the fixed policy of a British government, "which represents the sovereign head of the Church?"'

A certain reputation and influence was thus gained by a party, which put forth a claim from academic walls to reconcile many difficulties, and unite many advantages. We do not mean that Oriel College saw her sons produce the effect by any sudden or immediate process, or in the chronological order of such events as we are calling to mind in a desultory manner. Nor do we accuse the spirit alluded to of ever forming a very definite party, or of having concerted lines of action. We are not aware of any popular arts to propagate their sentiments, nor of any constraining power to prevent individuals overstepping the bounds of discretion in the common work. But, nevertheless, we trace a particular class of divines, some of whom were pupils of Dr. Copleston, gradually gaining the ear of Whig policy, and establishing themselves as the willing agents of anything which a Whig government might wish to do with the Church. Lord John Russell is fairly bitten with the Arnold school, but the world has yet to discover that Arnold's good qualities were other than individual virtues, or that his mantle of attraction can be thrown on disciples, who follow his ecclesiastical ideas. But what are the just pretensions to any true practical life, infused into the Church by these aiders and abettors of Erastian policy, these convenient instruments of Whig statesmen? Dr. Copleston assisted in the consecration of Dr. Hampden, once a Fellow of Oriel; but is the See of Hereford illuminated by any gleams of a new wisdom, which puts to flight the worn-out system of a traditional and black-letter Church? Has Archbishop Whately any magic power in the organization of his diocese, which may convince the world of a new discovery in Church discipline? Or, take the very last appointment of the present Ministry,—does the diocese of Norwich bask in any conscious or obvious enjoyment of those

powers attributed to Dr. Whately's old friend and disciple, in consequence of which Dr. Hinds has been honoured by the Crown with the commission to confine his visible and tangible presence to the house of the First Lord of the Treasury, at the same time that some spiritual unseen personality is supposed, by a marvellous art of episcopacy, to be enough for a bishop's local responsibilities in this enlightened age? The answer to these questions is, that this school of bishops has been tried and convicted of having nothing new to work a diocese withal, no fresh power, no enlightened fascination, no modern substitute for the supposed worn-out mediæval Church system; or, to turn to Cambridge appointments, will any party in Church or State accept Dr. Lee of Manchester as a model Bishop? What requirements has Dr. Maltby satisfied? Copleston promised well, but was disappointing in his subsequent principle of action; and so his disciples, in their various lines, may at one time have seemed to possess freshness and vigour, but when put on their trial, they turn out to be the remnants of a philosophy which, as an intellectual development, made a false start in England, and which has taken refuge in the caverns of Whiggism, betraying even, in the case of the Aggression Bill, that very principle of religious toleration, be it right or wrong, which was formerly its principal strength and universal watchword. The Whig appointments to the Church's high offices are a weight and drag to her energy, and are purposely meant to enslave her free action, to silence her true voice. The small pretext which could ever have been offered in defence of this school, that it would conduce to wholesome reforms, is now altogether obsolete. Its life is now gone, and we perceive nothing in it but the disposition to perpetuate burdens, under which the Church has laboured too long already.

But why has that cry of Church reform become fainter fainter as the party which raised it has gained office and power in the Church? Why has that ideal of reform seemed more and more impracticable as circumstances seem peculiarly to favour its accomplishment? Surely, if any adaptation of the English Church to modern philosophy could be carried out by men in power, having that as their professed object, difficulties have occurred which would seem to have been foreseen for them. The stage has been cleared for their performance, and parties combined for an attack. The whole of the session of Parliament the country was said to be anxiously waiting for such a result of its recent theological agitation. There was a certain imbecility in the movement, not to be excused but only felt, under which all such ideas sank down only the more helpless from the self-convicted?

compelled the boasted request of more than a quarter of a million to be refused even a few minutes' hearing in either house of Parliament.

It is true that the views we refer to have, in one form or other, gained high places in the Church, and been listened to with willing ears by those who have high places in the legislature, as well as by many so-called leaders of public opinion, but an antidote has all the time been at work ever commensurate with its influence. If we may trace the Arnold school to its beginning among some few Fellows of Oriel College, to the same source may we also look for a movement, a spirit raised up to oppose its evils. When the Church seemed to fare badly under the secular government,—when her bishoprics in Ireland were dealt with as if no more than police stations,—when her laxity seemed to be adopted as the very foundation of a new philosophy, and her discipline was assailed by the learned, the ignorant, and also by those practical men who judge of a principle by its working, and cannot be induced to care for what is obviously a farce,—then it was that many champions threw themselves, heart and soul, into the cause of reviving the Church's own doctrine, her own principles, as expressed in her own language, and as calculated to give life and fervency to the religion of her members.

Into this movement men of various minds threw themselves; but all seemed animated with the sense of having found a treasure whereon to expend their best labours, of having discovered a long dormant panacea for many existing evils. There were some who yearned for a deeper sense of devotion than seemed the characteristic of the religion around them. Others spoke of the neglect of self-denial, especially among the Clergy. Others hoped for some remedy of social grievances. Others were convinced of truth from the deeply poetic character of the Church doctrine, and her rule. Some dwelt on the noble pages of her history, and were captivated by her romance and chivalry. Some lamented the decay of ecclesiastical art, and strove for its revival, seeing therein a practical language by which to extend the whole views of the party. There were others who had become frightened at the revolutionary character of the age, and, conscious at the same time of the utter inability of any existing High-Church school to resist the popular stream, joined with timid voice the new Church party. There were not wanting other motives of a less real nature, connected, may be, with some accidental hobby, or with some philosophical love of testing a theory. Personal friendship, and the society of intellectual men lighted up with the charm of intense interest in a cause, were also motives which, for a

time, drew some within this sphere of influence. Wherever these men came from, Oriel common-room was the centre of the combination, and the parties which there assembled have left an abiding impression of brilliancy, genius, and absorbing interest on the minds of some then sharing in them, such as they feel to be not only an era in their own lives, but to have been the fountain of a wider-spreading movement. Meanwhile, however, there were friendships forming within the larger circle, which acted like committees, to undertake the initiative in any public demonstration. Nor was the stimulus of opposition long wanting. Cold, indifferent, and deaf to existing faults and abuses as either the old school of Church and State theology, or any philosophical movement of a later date, ever are, yet they exhibit singular acuteness in smelling out any true Church agitation; with animal instinct they fix upon it as their natural enemy, not regarding any temporary circumstance under which it may, perhaps, be seen by impartial eyes, that other causes of irritation are the true reason of their annoyance. It is common even for an individual, when out of temper with himself, to divert the grievance from internal self-conviction to some particular object of hostility which may happen on abstract grounds to be instinctively odious. High-Church sentiments have a peculiar facility in creating opposition; more than this we would not say, for, to appeal to the ways of Providence as a test of truth in any matter of controversy is an unfair begging of the question. We appeal not, therefore, to any abstract hatred of the truth on the part of the world in general: but we feel satisfied, in a simple review of facts, that the Oxford movement, at any rate, does not lack the testimony of having aroused persecution. College difficulties arose which deprived Oriel of many tutorial advantages, and which long hindered the prosperity it had arrived at. In fact, Oriel has ever since lived on past rather than present fame. Individual studies, however, were only the more prosecuted, from this absence of public responsibility nor was it likely that a number of Oxford men should keep any subject of interest to the bounds of the University without spreading their views in many provincial circles, according each one's local influence. Foreign travel, moreover, during the vacations, seemed to have a new charm belonging from the opening of fresh sensations connected with any proposed development of the familiar, but little understood, *Catholic Church*. It is not without interest now to look back on a fact, casually mentioned at the time, that Newman had much conversation with Dr. Wiseman in the nearly twenty years ago, on the probability of any mutual concessions by which a better feeling on the part of the

Church toward her continental sister might be induced. It is but fair to the subsequent Cardinal to mention, that inconsistency or delusive hopes are not to be attributed to him. The event in the case of those two individuals has borne out Dr. Wiseman's view as to which must be the yielding side. They parted, each to take his line; and, no doubt, there rests in the assumed Archbishop of Westminster a peculiar self-complacency as to the issue of their mental conflict, though not perhaps unalloyed with some vague apprehensions that all is, even yet, not at an end.

But we would confine ourselves to the Oxford movement. As anything practical seemed naturally to be required, and as the study of patristic theology, or ecclesiastical history, helped to clear up a certain vagueness which at first hung round many questions of discussion, it is obvious that men would understand each other's purposes, and see each other's characters, with more personal distinctness than before. Mutual apprehensions, suspicions, and jealousies (as previously referred to), to some extent arose; but a party thoroughly understanding each other, and united by no ordinary zeal, set themselves to the work of spreading those views which they saw were the Church's oldest heritage, but which the fashion of the age persevered in calling new. It was then that the party laid themselves open to the serious charge of being *Tractarians*, for certain papers issued forth from time to time, until the ninetieth seemed to have brought things to a climax in that stage of the movement's history. Meanwhile many occasions brought the general views of these writers, or the individual writers, into collision with the authorities of the University. The hand of persecution had spread from the smaller field already mentioned, to the larger one of the famed hebdomadal board. The necessity, however, of bringing larger forces to bear upon an enemy, implies that the enemy is itself also strengthened. The ordinary weapons of defence were used; Convocation was frequently appealed to, and on these occasions the University, nay, the whole country was overwhelmed with pamphlets, explanations, appeals, and exhortations, to prove intellectual conviction by personal presence in the Sheldonian Theatre. Periodical literature was a favourite method of proclaiming the general sentiments of the party, as well as its particular comments on local or temporary matters of controversy. The hebdomadal authorities, it was observed, had enjoyment of that peculiar obduracy of the moral cuticle, which makes it necessary to search for points of vital sensibility. Proof against plain argument, or the appeals of common-place justice, they yet winced a little under the well-aimed satire of their younger assailants. Meanwhile, the more joyous aspect of the party, as originally formed in Oriel common-

room, was now changed for the severities, the trials, and personal annoyances of an invidious undertaking. The controversy was extending beyond a University question; formerly it was a great development to become one. Mr. Charles Sumner spoke in harsh terms of the movement, as if it were the whole Church, and showing itself in every direction. We add, that a further scene of combat has been the revival of the Church's doctrines and teaching, in which is no longer only a matter of debate among Churchmen, but a question, but as occupying a large and noisy share of public attention? Her Majesty's prime minister has given it being considered a matter of political interest, by his speech, and that under circumstances of somewhat Quixotic enthusiasm enlisting himself under the banner of those who maintain what was originally the teaching of some few Fellows of the University. But any collegiate distinction in this work has long since fallen into a tradition preserved among those whose personal connection carries them back to its origin: nor is it a matter of public interest to recall it: it is because the subject-matter of the article is the late Provost of that college, that we are led to these reflections. Oriel has led us on to the present state of the logical controversy, not that to Oriel.

If such, then, is the magnitude to which this movement has grown, is it natural, or compatible with it to expect that great changes will not have come over the minds of its originators? Entering on a cause with the fervour of youth, and at the same time with that uncertainty of ultimate result which is the fate of highly sensitive intellects, does it not follow, against the cause, as a whole, that some have been true to their original aspirations, and are among its keenest supporters? May be, in the case of Dr. Newman, he had already fallen far into the previous tendencies we have ascribed to him, to be able to shake off their vague, unsettling influence when opposing their direct results. But in spite of this, off from the cause, in spite of some who, by the intensity of the storm themselves had raised, seem either for a time to be ably alienated from its objects, yet its quietest, its most earnest prime movers, are left in greater strength than might reasonably have been expected. Some who have known no change of motive, no change of opinion, from the very first; nay, whose personal exertions have been in one unbending direction, concerned whether engaged in controversy as at the instance of an individual friend, or boldly, yet modestly, asserting a renewed voice against the estates of the realm or the popular clamour.

We should, however, be entering upon an indefinitely large subject, for which we are by no means prepared, if we attempt to describe the various additions and defections which have happened to the 'Tractarian' movement. Some of the additions have been the cause of as much that is incongruous as the defections have exhibited in plainer language. All we would therefore point out, as the conclusion of this portion of our subject, is, that whatever perturbations, within and without, have alternately raised or shaken the party in public estimation, in influence, power, yet that there may be traced a steady feeling, and practical object, of a wonderfully uniform character, guiding its real centre. We attach not that centre to any name; but still the true spring of the cause rests not far off its original fountain: the close guidance of the party—for we cannot repudiate the name of party if we would—still hangs in easy and graceful balance over those directly or indirectly representing the friendly circle of past years. We repudiate not the name of party, indeed, it is thrust upon us; but at the same time it is obvious that the great influence which somehow or other has spread, arisen from its being a *movement* in opposition to a *party*. The party it has never been, in any exact or definable, and therefore in any obnoxious and reprehensible sense of the word. It never had a leader beyond that personal esteem and confidence which one may and ought to pay to another, where he sees good cause for it. It never had rules or terms of agreement, as all very well know who are conscious in how confused a way every public demonstration has been carried on. It never had a national club; it never wrote circulars to churchwardens, or carried any concocted plan of correspondence with its own adherents, and for this good reason, that it never knew who its adherents were. All the influence of the movement has been gained in an honest, fair, and legitimate manner. It has only been that which is produced by the free action of individual efforts in a land of liberty, and that which is earned by mutual respect and confidence in private life. Absurdities are part of human nature, and no cause can escape from their occasional ebullition; the real test of absurdity is, whether a thing is eventually broken down, convicted of a crime against common sense. Particular demonstration, and the fancies of particular individuals, may have been, but the cause has not. One person has not been regarded and truly thought guilty of another's folly; it is not enough to be a party for that to be the case. Those who talk most of *party* in an invidious sense, do so because they are unable to understand the peculiar ties which are mutually felt, and which being self-existent in the Church, are no adopted badge. There would have been correspondence enough, if all who are t

accused of being party men had been enrolled and communicated with from a central point of union. There is any such definite mutual understanding as this, O Church's working friends! But this movement has another and most important sense. Its definite influence is much in the number of its professed admirers, as well as in which it has forced upon others, even their opponents. It is such a thing in military tactics as forcing an opponent to another, in the form of a well-ordered march, to any apparent victory, till you are possessed of all you want or claim, and care little more what becomes of the enemy. The final and annihilating assault on 'Tractarianism' long delayed, though so many preparations seem to be going on through a course of years, that we can say they are all the while gaining, by little and little, the victory they contest for. Certain it is that although, as yet, they are viewed in as hostile a light as ever, yet many of their principal objects, their great truths and practical applications, are very generally adopted by all but extreme reactionaries. Compare, for instance, the general views of the respectable members of the English Church on baptismal regeneration, with what they were twenty years ago. No one will deny the universal hold which that doctrine has taken, in spite of all preachings and legal decisions to the contrary. Look to the diocese of Exeter. Could the reforms have been carried out as it has been, twenty years ago? Compare again the arrangements, both ritual and architectural, now prevail, with the state of our churches in the same time ago. It is amazing how an impulse has penetrated the remotest corners of the land. They will not build the flagrant churches which used to be built; high pews are obsolete in the carpenter's art. Simplicity is extensively cultivated; while punctuality, reverence, and a certain amount of ceremonial dignity is now universal, by any intelligent congregation. Candlestick and altar may still be objected to; but much has, undoubtedly, been gained in due reverence toward the administration of the sacraments. Chanting may still be more or less unpopular, but less hurrying over of the prayers, as a mere introduction to the sermon, or for no other account but that of laziness, is tolerated as it used to be. Moreover the more beneficent workings of *Tractarian* views are everywhere springing up. The indefatigable labours of twenty years have rewarded, even by results in some degree picturesque, the type of a revived Church worshipping in the best manner. Think also of the influence possessed through the

tions which have never ceased to supply the Church instruct of young and old, rich and poor. Newspapers, periodicals, and the power of the press generally, are the most important medium in the present day by which sentiments are conveyed from one to others, and by which subjects of interest obtain a hearing, as selfishness and injustice are exposed. There is no legitimate class of literature which is not enlisted in the Church's cause, nor can this open and bold use of the intellectual arena of the day, fail to impress on the public mind that they who flinch from such ordeal, in spite of persecution, and in spite of often pecuniary loss, have truth and common sense at the bottom. It is a remarkable proof of the *mens conscia recti* on the part of 'Tritarians,' which, when looked upon as a consistent line of policy from first to last, cannot but win the esteem of honest and impartial men, is the habitual appeal to law and to the courts of their country. Men who feel that they are introducing a new element into the constitution, are not willing to throw themselves upon the decision of its written laws. The Church party, however, has always striven to work out its peculiar aims in the same legal and constitutional manner that other grievances are rectified by other claims asserted. They have thrown themselves on the country, appealing to its written laws, its justice, and its common sense; and it is sad to think that their confidence has been, more than one occasion, betrayed. Let high powers beware the risk they incur by discouraging legitimate appeals to right and reason, in this age of voluntary confederation and irregular leaguings together to obtain by force whatever men desire. Yet, who can tell the good which has been done by these appeals whatever the immediate verdict may have been? Theology and ecclesiastical questions have been carried with infinite labour, care, and novelty of investigation, through every legal court in the country, up to the notorious Committee of Privy Council. Is this for nothing? May it not have been an education, or in some way a preparation for a better mode, hereafter, of settling the disputes of our Church? The experience and wisdom gained by those lengthened investigations, we are sure, will not all be lost. A little mature consideration on subjects thus suddenly brought to the notice of our legal courts, may work a change of feeling by the next time that their services are required. We at any rate, have that confidence in the Church's cause, that we only want a fair, impartial, and constitutional tribunal; and in proportion as that is obtained, so far will our wishes be granted as our objects attained.

But we have wandered far from Dr. Copleston, and have wandered too far to make it worth while returning. *Requiescat in pace.*

ART. II.—*College Life in the Time of James the First, treated by an Unpublished Diary of Sir Symonds D'Ewes, and M.P.* London: John W. Parker. 1851.

A MEMBER of the Long Parliament would naturally himself to our imagination as a fierce, gloomy, and unscrupulous fanatic,—a man of dark passions and determined resolution. The horrors of injustice, sacrilege, rebellion, and murder he must have been party to, make the blood run cold in every thought of such a grim presence. Yet we are not without forgiveness, and especially when death has disfigured the objects of our horror, and many generations of men have since their vapoury but noxious lives were a burden on earth's ways. That dark conclave of Westminster before our eyes in simple attire, almost in the dress of ascetics; yet we trace a military adaptation of a religion which curtailed flowing locks and embroidered coats of arms in favour of principles of convenience as well as of religion. If it seemed to say, 'We have no frivolous vanity; our things unseen,' it seemed also to have for its object to show of muscle and sinew, in immediate readiness to support a supernatural theory by the powers of nature, or to make reasonings by physical force. We hear them use sacred and a style of illustration which implies considerable acquaintance with the sacred writings; yet, as if to cut off that which we are disposed to feel toward all whose religious opinions are in any way single-minded, or even in the practice of morals, whatever their obedience to the hear designs for deluging their country with blood, murdering the Lord's anointed rulers, on the throne or in the council chamber, and at the altar.

But it is often said that men associated together are more unscrupulous than individuals acting on their single responsibility; members also of a violent and energetic body, carried on to agree with what they have not the influence to prevent, but have not the courage to protest against.

Sir Symonds D'Ewes, Baronet, who is the subject of the work before us, was of this long and memorable party. He was therefore a party to many of the evils we have mentioned. But with his parliamentary position we have no concern; we purpose to look into the early training,

constituent part of so terrible a body of men. Nor shall we concern ourselves much with his individual character even though but rather the condition of that University which trained him responsible an actor in the great seventeenth-century drama. Yet we cannot but moralize on the great truth that Union makes strength; for men like Sir Symonds could certainly not carry much weight single-handed, or be very formidable disturbers of order. It is curious to trace so gloomy a performance of public responsibilities in mature life to the silly affectations of a thirteenth-rate yet well-meaning youth. We see him boring his friends with the 'scholar-like use of the Latin tongue' in conversation; we see his intense desire to excel in theological declamation with a somewhat ridiculous failure; we find him eager beyond all bounds in the hearing and criticism of sermons; and cannot but trace in all these habits of mind the conceited fanaticism with which he was afterwards associated, and which was disastrous in its results.

Before, however, we proceed to draw any conclusions, though we may imagine to be derivable from this book, it is right that we notice its composition, in order that our readers may judge how far it is to be relied on, as presenting a genuine picture. The book is entertaining; but more, perhaps, in proportion to the contact with which the original matter is cooked up, than to the simplicity with which the hero speaks for himself. It only partly professes to be a diary, so largely is it made up by a modern hand. Bits, and those generally very short ones, of the professed genuine matter, are interspersed with large and copious modern writing. It must necessarily give it a seeming want of authenticity; it must weaken it as a thing to be relied on, and so far make it optional to credit, or not, any deduction that may be apparent on the surface of the book. The quaintness of phraseology used in the reign of James I. may also partly dispose the nineteenth century of 'Pepys his diary' to view an unfairly humorous version of antiquely-written journals. Nevertheless, on the whole, we are content to accept this book as being, in a great measure, a fair representation of the man whose diary it is illustrated. There are touches of unmistakable individuality in some extracts, which so far harmonize with the general tone of the book, that, leaving it an open question for others to do the same, or not, as they think fit, we shall not hesitate to accept the portrait as genuine, and shall proceed on that supposition.

The rise of Puritan doctrine and manners was as conspicuous in Cambridge during the early part of the seventeenth century as an opposite tendency is said now to be the characteristic of Oxford. Sir Symonds was born nearly with the century.

ART. II.—*College Life in the Time of James the First, as illustrated by an Unpublished Diary of Sir Symonds D'Ewes, Baronet, and M.P.* London: John W. Parker. 1851.

A MEMBER of the Long Parliament would naturally present himself to our imagination as a fierce, gloomy, and unscrupulous fanatic,—a man of dark passions and determined resolution. The horrors of injustice, sacrilege, rebellion, and murder, which he must have been party to, make the blood run cold at the very thought of such a grim presence. Yet we are framed for forgiveness, and especially when death has disabled the objects of our horror, and many generations of men have passed since their vapoury but noxious lives were a burden upon earth's ways. That dark conclave of Westminster we see before our eyes in simple attire, almost in the dress of professed ascetics; yet we trace a military adaptation of a religious dress, which curtailed flowing locks and embroidered coats, on principles of convenience as well as of religion. If their dress seemed to say, 'We have no frivolous vanity; our trust is in things unseen,' it seemed also to have for its object the display of muscle and sinew, in immediate readiness to support the supernatural theory by the powers of nature, or metaphysical reasonings by physical force. We hear them use sacred words, and a style of illustration which implies considerable acquaintance with the sacred writings; yet, as if to cut off that sympathy which we are disposed to feel toward all whose religious impressions are in any way single-minded, or even in theory include the practice of morals, whatever their obedience may be, we hear designs for deluging their country with blood, and for murdering the Lord's anointed rulers, on the throne, at the council chamber, and at the altar.

But it is often said that men associated together are more unscrupulous than individuals acting on their single responsibility; members also of a violent and energetic body may be carried on to agree with what they have not the influence to prevent, but have not the courage to protest against.

Sir Symonds D'Ewes, Baronet, who is the subject of the work before us, was of this long and memorable parliament. He was therefore a party to many of the evils we have mentioned. But with his parliamentary position we have no concern; we purpose to look into the early training of this

ART. II.—*College Life in the Time of James the First, as illustrated by an Unpublished Diary of Sir Symonds D'Ewes, Baronet, and M.P.* London: John W. Parker. 1851.

A MEMBER of the Long Parliament would naturally present himself to our imagination as a fierce, gloomy, and unscrupulous fanatic,—a man of dark passions and determined resolution. The horrors of injustice, sacrilege, rebellion, and murder, which he must have been party to, make the blood run cold at the very thought of such a grim presence. Yet we are framed for forgiveness, and especially when death has disabled the objects of our horror, and many generations of men have passed since their vapoury but noxious lives were a burden upon earth's ways. That dark conclave of Westminster we see before our eyes in simple attire, almost in the dress of professed ascetics; yet we trace a military adaptation of a religious dress, which curtailed flowing locks and embroidered coats, on principles of convenience as well as of religion. If their dress seemed to say, 'We have no frivolous vanity; our trust is in things unseen,' it seemed also to have for its object the display of muscle and sinew, in immediate readiness to support the supernatural theory by the powers of nature, or metaphysical reasonings by physical force. We hear them use sacred words, and a style of illustration which implies considerable acquaintance with the sacred writings; yet, as if to cut off that sympathy which we are disposed to feel toward all whose religious impressions are in any way single-minded, or even in theory include the practice of morals, whatever their obedience may be, we hear designs for deluging their country with blood, and for murdering the Lord's anointed rulers, on the throne, at the council chamber, and at the altar.

But it is often said that men associated together are more unscrupulous than individuals acting on their single responsibility; members also of a violent and energetic body may be carried on to agree with what they have not the influence to prevent, but have not the courage to protest against.

Sir Symonds D'Ewes, Baronet, who is the subject of the work before us, was of this long and memorable parliament. He was therefore a party to many of the evils we have mentioned. But with his parliamentary position we have no concern; we purpose to look into the early training of this

entered into its broad marks of character, and its external features, with that peculiar heartiness which is almost confined to such as are not endowed by nature with any very distinct individuality. It is indeed humiliating to any presumption of genius, which may be set up in behalf of those who have taken a prominent part in the epochs of English ecclesiastical history, to see the very great sameness in both the subjects about which men were excited, and in the arguments used on either side. It is humiliating to observe this, if nothing is looked for but material for hero worship; but it is at the same time the strongest confirmation of the reality of these common and apparently worn-out topics of religious discussion. The two distinctive ideas of the Christian religion expressed by the Puritan and the Church parties, have never ceased their hostility since the Reformation; there has been no harmony of these contrary elements, except when both have been torpid and inactive. That fancied repose in our Church, with two opposite principles co-existing, but not interfering, is altogether a fallacy. Great outbreaks there have been which, in the pages of history, absorb all attention, leaving the intermediate periods quite free from such-like influences and disputes; but facts show that these seasons of quiet were but by comparison,—were but the subsiding of one outburst or the gradual approach of another. The Elizabethan divines were polemical on one side, as the followers of Laud were on the other; nor was the intermediate reign of James I. remarkable for any amicable settlement of difficulties, if we may judge from Sir Symonds's Diary. The age of the Commonwealth was neither famed for mutual concessions nor individual comfort; and 1688 had not long after a peculiar aspect of ecclesiastical history, of which it is sufficient to our present purpose to say, that the part of our Prayer-book 'given at our Court at Kensington, the twenty-first day of June, 1837,' by 'J. Russell,' too carefully commemorates the notice of certain 'cruel and bloodthirsty enemies,' to make this *Albertian* era any exception to our present argument. With regard to the 18th century and the Georgian *fidei defensores*, the less said on either side the better, for they do not manifest any development of moral or religious zeal, as the result of an apparent subsidence of theological disputation; and, in modern times, we may easily identify the subjects of difference with those that have prevailed at all previous times of religious activity.

This Puritan element being then, by nature, parasitical in the side of the English Church, it is only force of circumstance which brings forward individuals as prominent exponents of such views at periods like that of the Long Parliament. There

may have been power and talent in forcing on those circumstances; but the vapoury talk of Sir Symonds D'Ewes, when he speaks of 'the noisome and corrupt teaching of justification by works, free will, and Christ's bodily presence in the Lord's Supper,' as 'causing his soul to fetch many deep sighs,' do not imply any novelty of imagination or original genius.

Poor Sir Symonds, however, had not learned to use this language in so open a manner when a humble student. We therefore wish to look into his more innocent days, not so much, as we have said, on his own account, for we doubt whether his character is such as to merit a commemoration of two centuries, but for the sake of illustrating Cambridge life during his residence in that University.

Sir Symonds was son of a wealthy lawyer, holding a lucrative office in the Court of Chancery, and living at Stowlangtoft Hall in Suffolk. He was educated at Bury School, where his industry was much approved, and on one occasion attracted his father's attention; for when travelling through Bury, at midnight, he saw his son's window still lighted up when all others were dark. From school he went to St. John's College, Cambridge, as a Fellow-commoner, at the age of sixteen; and by this time nature had given him, according to his own information, a well-favoured and pleasing countenance, with a full and quick black eye. As, however, he confesses to a slight obliquity of vision, we are left in doubt whether the expression *eye* denote a conventional duality, or a literal singularity. Though not allowed to indulge in the 'prevailing taste for rich and costly apparel,' yet he wore silk stockings, with garters and roses to match, which cost two guineas, while his fellow-commoner gown cost four pounds seven shillings. We do not imagine that the strictest Puritan simplicity made it necessary that these garments should be a complete inventory of his wardrobe; but no further details are handed down to posterity. From nature and art, as exemplified in his personal appearance, we would next inquire into his pecuniary circumstances. His father was not profuse in the allowance which he gave him. Sixty pounds was urged, both by Symonds and his tutor, as the smallest annual allowance which could maintain the position of a Fellow-commoner; but the father would not exceed fifty, which was at length agreed to, and accepted with good grace, as the following extract would imply, at the same time that it proves his allowance too small:—

'It affords some proof that Symonds's discontent was not altogether unfounded, when we find him, twenty years after this, making precisely the same complaint. He acknowledges, at the same time, that his father's parsimony was productive of good, inasmuch as it caused him to "avo

unnecessary acquaintance, idle visits, and many needless expenses." Those who had the greatest allowance were often the most apt to exceed their allowance; like a friend of his own who was thus "brought into decay," and at last driven to serve as a soldier in Bohemia. And although when he happened to fall in with some child of a "too indulgent" parent, and saw him "in his rich apparel, and his man after him," while he himself appeared "in good ordinary clothes," and without a servant, it struck him now and then that "it would have been fitter if it had been otherwise;" yet, in general, he found that it "bred" in him humility, and that he was induced "to prize and to seek after other comforts of a nature more divine and excellent." When we find him, however, obliged to pass the booksellers' shops with a longing eye, and "constrained to abandon two great volumes of Keckerman," because he is at the time actually "in want of necessaries;" and when we are told that he is obliged, reluctantly, to decline the offer of Professor Downes, to assist him in the study of Greek, because his "small means" would afford "no worthy requital," we cannot but acknowledge, that if the well-stored purse of Paul D'Ewes had been opened somewhat more freely, its overflowings would not have been very ill laid out.—Pp. 17, 18.

Soon after his admission into the college, he had to undergo the ordeal of 'salting,' which consisted of standing on the high table, stripped of his gown, and made to look 'like a scoundrel,' in order to address the audience in a humorous speech. In proportion as he succeeded in producing amusement, so was he rewarded with caudle; salted beer being substituted if he was dull, with certain 'abrasions of the skin from the chin to the under lip, with the thumb nail.' On such occasions a great deal of beer was drunk; and our hero, though habitually temperate, yet had so little rest one night, although 'in no wit distempered' in his brain, that he resolves most cautiously 'to avoid all nimety in this kind' for the future.

There are some interesting notices of the successive Masters of S. John's College, from 1586 to the end of the Commonwealth, given as an introduction to Sir Symonds's residence there, which we will briefly run through. From 1586 to 1595, Dr. Whitaker was Master. He was recommended to the College by Queen Elizabeth; and although some of the Fellows were rash enough to resist this act of royalty, yet eventually he carried the day. He is thus described:—

'In fact, he was looked upon as little less than a prodigy in learning. At the age of thirty-one he was the Regius Professor of Divinity. His controversial writings against popery were text-books with all Protestant divines, and Cardinal Bellarmine pronounced him to be the most learned heretic he had ever met with. In the government of his college, he was equally pre-eminent. He found it occupied by a host of bitter opponents, jealous of his authority, captious in scrutinising all his proceedings; but his straightforwardness and lenity so won upon them all, that at last he had no enemies left to overcome. The petty factions into which they had been divided were broken up. He took care that the rewards of learning were impartially distributed, and by his example he endeavoured to make the fellows prudent and learned men like himself. The system of bribery

College Life in the Time of James I.

which of late had been shamelessly practised, he utterly suppressed. He would often be present while the tutors were lecturing; administering the students, as they required it, his encouragement and advice. The college so prospered under his government, and students flocked into it so fast that it became a little university in itself. No fewer than thirty-eight fellow-commoners, as Baker seems to have made it appear, entered the college at the same time;—more, he observes, than it ever numbered before will probably ever number again.'—Pp. 20, 21.

It is also mentioned, that though 'twice married,' his wife never lived in college.

Dr. Clayton succeeded Whitaker, being also nominated to the Crown, in opposition to appointment by the Fellows. He was no Puritan, but also not much of a scholar. What, however, he lacked in this respect he made up for in activity about the secular affairs of the college. He built the second court, and his period of office is thus described:—

'While the college increased in buildings, it diminished in reputation. Overjoyed with the erection of their new court, the fellows neglected other studies for the study of architecture. The contemplative quiet of the house was broken with axes and hammers.'—P. 23.

Dr. Gwynne succeeded Clayton, and was Master of the College from 1612 to 1633, which included the residence of the Symonds. He was chosen by a party in college who preferred an inferior man whom they could manage, to a distinguished master over themselves; and it excited considerable annoyance to the better part of the college, to see Morton, Carey, and Senhouse, afterwards Bishops of Durham, Exeter, and Carlisle, passed over, and a Welchman of no pretensions to scholarship appointed. Nevertheless, the college flourished well under him. Lord Strafford, Lord Falkland, and Lord Fairfax were students in his time. His theological bias we may conclude from his being a friend of Williams, and opposed by Laud. The college was much divided in the election of his successor; the seniors appointing a crown nominee, and the juniors choosing, by a majority of votes, another candidate. During the dispute the Crown put in a third candidate by Royal mandate. This was Dr. Beale, of the Laudian school, of whom it is said:—

'One Dr. Beale has caused such a general adoration to be practised and towards the sacraments, that many godly-fellows and scholars of the house have left their places in order to avoid the abomination.'—Pp. 25, 26.

Beale was at length displaced in 1644, and Arrowsmith, a Puritan, put in, who was succeeded by Tuckney in 1653, who is thus mentioned:—

'Baker says, that his discipline was good, and that he "was held in much reverence as any master ever was." The annals of the college in his time are graced by the two illustrious names of Stillingfleet and Beveridge. As Vice-chancellor, he adopted vigorous measures for the propagation

the gospel in America, and for the conversion of the Indians. At the Restoration, a set of the younger fellows forgot the gratitude which they owed to the venerable old man who had "brought them on in their studies" by his encouragement, and they so undermined his authority by complaints lodged against him at Court, that he resigned his mastership, partly through vexation and partly through fear; and having a pension allowed him out of the stipend of his successor, he ended his days in retirement.—Pp. 26, 27.

In an age like this, when we are governed much by precedents in law and historical evidence, it is a most valuable study in University politics, to examine how colleges have managed themselves in times past. Perhaps there will be struggles in our own Universities before the next generation of Heads of Houses are all chosen.

Of other members of S. John's, there are some notices which are interesting in themselves, or serve to illustrate academic life. Senhouse, who preached at the coronation of Charles I., is thus mentioned:—

'He suffered the college intrigues and petty factions to take their course, "caring little to make them subservient to his own advancement." Although in Baker's opinion eminently suited for the mastership, he appears to have lived contentedly within the walls of his college, without ever aspiring to it; not making light of the ease and comforts which surrounded him, nor willing to emerge from his retirement except when solicited by others. Some one has recorded of him the following characteristic story,—Having once at his table certain friends who were in danger of quarrelling over the discussion of a point of difference between two writers of antiquity, he interrupted them by observing that after all it was a difference which might easily be reconciled, as he would satisfy them in a moment. Retiring therefore into his study as if for the purpose of reference, he summoned the disputants immediately afterwards to follow him, and there he exhibited to them the authors in question quietly reposing on the table with a cup of sack between them.

'He was fond of fishing; a taste probably acquired among the lakes and rivers of his native Cumberland. *Ex piscatione nihil mali*:—was an apophthegm frequently addressed to him by Symonds, who was also a brother of the angle.—P. 28.

Professor Downes had the reputation of being the ablest Grecian in Christendom, and was one of the translators of the Bible. He revived the study of Greek in S. John's, which is said to have been almost forgotten, partly from the change of religion, and partly from the theological controversies which exclusively occupied men's attention. As a preacher he did not equally excel, neither was he eminent in manners:—

'Downes was no less remarkable for an eccentricity of manners and temper, than for his erudition. The six reviewers of the translation of the Bible held their meetings in London; but Downes would not move from his quiet fireside at Cambridge to join them until he was threatened with a pursuivant. And he contracted an invincible dislike for his learned pupil, Thomas Bois; simply because he had persuaded himself that Sir Henry Savile thought more highly of Bois's assistance in the editing of Chrysostom, than of his own. When Symonds first called upon him, "at his house,

College Life in the Time of James I.

near the public Schools," he found him reading, with his hat on, his legs upon a table. "His carriage was homely," says Symonds, "stirred neither his hat nor his body, only taking me by the hand." preacher his performances were but little to the taste of the sermonists of the day: and it is said that when, upon one occasion, his audience forgot the respect due to his character and his office as "to begin to descend down from the pulpit uttering a solemn and audible asseveration that no one should ever see his face in that place again. He is described Symonds, as being "of an extraordinary tallness, with a long face, ruddy complexion, and a very quick eye."—Pp. 31, 32.

An anecdote is related of Archbishop Williams, which is his own tale:—

'About ten years before the present time, it happened that William afterwards the Lord-Keeper, held the office of Proctor during Gooch's Chancellorship: and that in the discharge of this office he exhibited an independence of manner somewhat offensive to the authorities. Upon the Vice-Chancellor requested him to pause and consider what he might find himself as soon as the year of his Proctorship should be at issue. "Marry," replied the Welchman, "I shall be as honest a man as you if you wait a few years longer, perhaps I may be a better man than you." The self-sufficiency betrayed in this retort will appear somewhat less ingenious, when we remember that Williams had already got his foot up the ladder of promotion. He was appointed chaplain to the Lord of Ellesmere during the present year of his proctorship.'—Pp. 39, 40.

Symonds's own tutor, Holdsworth, was a distinguished and worthy man. He was an eminent preacher, and when at Langtoft, visiting his pupil, he preached 'so sweetly and judiciously,' that Symonds 'began to like him better than his father.' When rector of St. Peter-le-poor, it is said that 'the most might be seen standing upon the very walls and pillars of the church, in sympathy with the tears that stood in the eyes of his crowded auditories.' He became Master of Emmanuel College and was Vice-Chancellor during the three critical years leading up to 1641. When Symonds was under him, we do not gather that he resisted his Puritan tendency, but rather the reverse; yet he must have changed materially in his views, as we judge from the very honourable facts related of him in the following passage:—

'In the year 1644, he was ejected from his mastership, and soon afterwards committed to the Tower. While he lay in the Tower he was recommended by the University to the Margaret Professorship of Divinity; and he also made a special request that he might attend him as his chaplain at Holdenby House: but neither of these offices was he allowed to accept. Notwithstanding the efforts made, even by friends of the parliament, for his liberation, he was kept in the Tower for four years. An earnest application on his behalf was made to our friend D'Ewes himself, by Dr. Brownrigg, Vice-Chancellor of the University, and Bishop of Exeter; who represented it as a work worthy of D'Ewes's eloquence, to make intercession with the most honourable assembly, for a person at the same time so dear to himself, and so ill to be spared by the University. It is suggested, that Selden and D'Ewes, the antistites of polite letters, and the hierophants

antiquity, should unite in asking for the boon, surely the humanity of an illustrious senate would not refuse to grant it. Whether or not the final liberation of Holdsworth was in any degree owing to D'Ewes's intercession, does not appear. He seems to have fallen under the especial displeasure of Cromwell. After regaining his liberty he waited upon the King at Hampton Court, and accepted from him the nominal appointment of Dean of Worcester, though in better times he had declined a bishopric. Being already worn out with grief and hard usage, he sank under the shock which came over him on hearing of the King's death. His estate he bequeathed to pious uses, and his books to the college.

'Holdsworth is said to have been of a comely person, with an expressive and pleasing countenance. His disposition was kind and affectionate. Symonds always speaks of him as his "loving tutor," and records the sense he entertained of his love and humility in "walking" with him and making him his "equal fere." Over the undisciplined mind of Symonds he exercised a salutary control, and he continued to give him friendly advice by letter, long after their connexion as tutor and pupil had ceased to exist. His visits at Stow-langtoft, were always looked forward to with pleasure; and when Symonds was smarting there under a very severe disappointment, the most effective consolation that he received, was from his old tutor, Holdsworth.'—Pp. 35—37.

D'Ewes entered college, it would seem, with fair pretensions to mix in good society, and at first he was much disposed to refuse no overtures; but the narrowness of his income, and a caution from his good tutor, kept him from falling into many snares on account of this disposition. Moreover, there was a religious tone about him, together with a certain priggishness in its manifestation, which made him unsuited to the society of *fast* men in the time of James I. He neither liked their ways, nor their ridicule of himself. Amongst his friends are mentioned several aristocratic names, who afterwards attained more or less notoriety in the political world. At present, however, let us be content with the fact that he was in a position to enjoy their society, and look to his Cambridge career without the distractions of futurity. One of his first exploits was nearly being his last, for with an eagerness for early rising which we seldom remember in freshmen of the nineteenth century, he set to work ringing the college bell at six o'clock on S. Thomas's morning, and that with such zeal, that he was carried aloft and nearly killed. His father came after an interval of five days, which was necessary for a summons from London, at the rate of travelling then in use, and happily found him restored.

From his companions and his misfortunes let us look to his studies:—

'The great University subjects of study were Logic, Ethics, and Physics. The compendious treatises of Keckerman, and Molinæus, Piccolominaeus and Golius, Polanus, Ramus, and Magirus, most of them foreign Protestant divines, were the books at present in vogue. Classical studies were subordinate, and reserved for the evening. Mr. Holdsworth "read exceeding well at nights upon Virgil's Eclogues." The only books which Symonds professes

College Life in the Time of James I.

to have made his "own," or mastered, were Suetonius, Florus, Maci and Aulus Gellius. His knowledge of Greek was "scarcely worth sp of;" and inasmuch as he "knew too well that no perfection co attained in that tongue without much labour," he despaired of "any success." All his reading in Greek seems to have been confined to two orations of Demosthenes, upon which Professor Downes had les and "a small portion of Aristotle's *Œconomics* and *Politics*." But scholarship had been for some time at a low ebb in S. John's,—Pp.

Theology was much in vogue, as a practical subject; in p exercises and declamation, as well as reading. D'Ewes t himself with peculiar zeal into this system. He attende lectures of the Margaret Professor of Divinity. He was sent always at 'catechisings' in college chapel; 'at which, 'royal decree, every member under the degree of Master of 'was examined in the elements of divinity. He made a poi 'attending all the sermons at S. Mary's, whether on Sunda 'Saints'-days; and his sorrow is recorded on having once "m 'a clerum:'"—

'Of his own public performances Symonds has not omitted to le memorial. It was the custom for the "Bachelor commencers" to sit schools during the whole of Lent,—“except they bought it out,”—a defend themselves against all opponents. Symonds entered the list "disputed extempore upon two Sophisters, the one of Trinity, and the of Christ's." One of these Respondents "took" his questions, and attack upon the other he was cut short by the coming in of the Pro nevertheless he was so satisfied, that he "scarce knew" himself "thought it long" before he could try his fortune again. The next ing, however, he found himself pitted with an antagonist who puzzle "intolerably," and "plucked down" some of his plumes. He came crest-fallen, and with a heavy heart joined the party to which he w. vited by the Respondent. These conventional merry-meetings had into so serious an abuse that they were prohibited soon after this und name of "comessationes:" and our hero himself, fearing to be br into "the society of some of the looser sort," resolved to "forbear thither any more." He resolved also not to forget the check which been given to his self-conceitedness, and in consequence he abstained looking after "a Moderatorship," which previously he had intended. For this he was afterwards sorry; and although he knew that he have "missed the mark," even if he had "gained the Moderator: it became a source of unavailing grief and regret.

'Soon after this he appeared as the Respondent in an Act in the c chapel, his opponent being "that prime student" Mr. Gervase Ne already mentioned as one of his "entire friends." In consideration "the miscarriage in such affairs doth breed vexation in ourselves and tempt in others," he not only used all diligence in preparing for it, bu prayed to God for "a happy issue" in this his undertaking. He was rently aware that there were some in the college who would exult ill success. At length the day arrived; and having risen early with a to punctuality and "quick despatch," when "the bell sounded" he sented himself in due form in the chapel with his "friendly advers But the result fell short of his anticipations. The "hour was up" t his much-studied argument was ended; and the moderator "brake i abruptly, much to his discontent, before he had said "one half" of wt

had intended to say. The fellows and fellow-commoners then adjourned to "the parlour," where "sack-possets" were prepared for them at the Respondent's expense: and as they all sat comfortably before a good fire, Symonds doubted not that his cheer was more palatable to the company than the previous disputation had been. He seems to have fancied that they made themselves merry at his expense in more senses than one: and during the whole of the next day he was overwhelmed by "a deep and dangerous melancholy." —Pp. 66—68.

D'Ewes was ambitious, it would seem, in general literature equally beyond his powers. Poetry he attempted, but, though he admired the 'Faery Queen,' he failed to be a second Spenser. He had many other 'wild cogitations of an agile fancy':—

"Essays upon oeconomics, politics, and ethics; physiological treatises upon dreams, time, and place; dialogues, by way of conference, like unto the French Academy; collectanea, in imitation of Aulus Gellius; translations from Horace into English verse:" all these, one after another, he thought might "easily be brought to pass." And although he found out at length that he had "heven out" more than he could finish; yet he "doubted not" that he should "leave somewhat to the world worthy of remembrance," if it "should please God to send" him life.—Pp. 71, 72.

Whatever he undertook was with a solemnity of 'initiation' which contrasted but poorly with the accomplished result. His diary, however, we probably now owe to this preparatory care for the protection of his literary offspring:—

'Having taken the idea from his friend Jeffray, who admitted him to a sight of the numerous common-place books which he had formed under various titles, such as "Serpens et Columba,—Consiliarius,—Symposiacs;" Symonds procured a suitable book for the purpose, and "delivered it to an honest and painful man, to be ruled with red ink, and strongly bound." Another volume of very ample dimensions he appropriated to collections in divinity: a certain preacher at S. Mary's having publicly remonstrated with his audience for filling their books with memoranda in other arts and sciences, "while the chiefest of them all was neglected."—P. 72.

The general state of religion or morals in the University does not seem to have been good, and George Herbert agreed with the Puritans in denouncing the 'growing atheism' of the age. The University was called 'Mater artium, neverca virtutum.' D'Ewes, however, was a commendable exception in his strictness of life and sincere piety. He was most careful in religious observances, and a regular communicant. Incidental mention is made of alms-giving and visiting the sick, with commendation of a certain preacher, who, quoting S. Chrysostom, showed that 'the poor serve as carriers, to transport the treasures of pious rich men to heaven, where they will find them when they arrive there themselves.'

On theological points we will not trouble our readers with discourses of Jeffray's on baptism, the star of the Magi, the descent into hell, in which our hero was rapt up with joy; nor will we follow them when they 'fell to talking' as to whether

David and his child would 'hold conference with each the Hebrew tongue.' It is a matter of surprise, however, so proficient an amateur in theology should not have Orders. This, however, he declined; perhaps at his wish, or may be (it is suggested) because D'Ewes himself somewhat of a worshipper of rank, thought it might sufficiently aristocratic profession.

One Shrove Tuesday Holdsworth entertained Symonds an account of that day's observance in the north:—

'He called it, "the London prentices' madness, the country mildness, and all England's feast-day." He said that the poor would spend their last shilling, "rather than lack a suitable mement;" and that they would "rise from their beds" to finish their sumed viands, rather than let them remain until the morning Wednesday.'—P. 82.

At St. John's Lent was thus observed:—

'It appears that on Fridays, during the season of Lent, the diet at St. John's consisted solely of fish: and it appears, also, that "the fish was mended by a fleshy supper." In the other colleges, too, the same custom prevailed.'—P. 83.

Every one who has been present at Commemoration will remember the licence of tongue which is allowed and tolerated in the undergraduate gallery. The noisy and ill-regulated expression of the popular voice, which on those occasions is so scattered in its whole operation, was formerly centred in one individual, called the Prevaricator, who acted much to the part for the assembled University, that the professed fool for a nobleman's household. Personal criticisms on the doct happened to be present, were favourite topics of his were any others exempt, who could afford amusement. The men of this wit we will venture to extract, which assume the form of a 'questio' after the fashion of the schools. A little out of our hero's undergraduate days, for the circumstances of it are founded on the restoration of Charles II.:—

'At length he proceeds to one of his "questiones;" under prove that *omnis motus est circularis*.

'In the first place it holds good in the Government. The sea the mariner's needle, having gone round the compass, settles again North; pointing to Charles's wain, and signifying that Charles may take possession of his wain. It holds good also in the circulation of blood, both in the body natural and in the body politic. The King Charles was shed twelve years ago, and now comes round for shedding the blood of those who condemned him. Again, in the succession of Masters and Fellows of colleges; those who were ejected for refusing the engagement being now restored, and they were made Masters and Fellows in their place being now ejected. any one calls out to the men of Pembroke, *Cujum pecus?* they answer

1 Their formerly ejected Master, Dr. Laney, being now restored

The *fluctus decumanus*, after ten years, bears them into their places again, while it sweeps away the present possessors with all their spoil. In this tenth year, some of the rural clergy must hand over their tithes to others. The circular motion holds good also in regard to a certain clerical member of S. John's, who having gone away with a desire to be elected a member of Parliament for the county of Lancaster, comes back to Cambridge disappointed, and now desires to resume his duties as a clergyman.

"Si fortuna volet, fies de Rhetore Consul,
Si volet hæc eadem, fies de Consule Rhetor."

'With the beads, again, *omnis motus est circularis*. Take a circular dish, charged with savoury viands, and place it before a beak, and you will straightway see his fork make a tangent thereto, and his knife a secant. And with the Oxford men their wit moves also in a circle; inasmuch as in nothing it begins, and in nothing ends.

"Sic redit in nihilum quod fuit ante nihil."—Pp. 86—88.

To identify D'Ewes in his University character with the reign of James I., we cannot omit an amusing specimen of impotent bombast on the part of that monarch:—

'About this time much interest was excited in the University by news from London, that "the King with all the peers" had gone in state to S. Paul's, "the streets being railed off" for the convenience of the procession; and that the Bishop of London, Dr. King, had preached before them "a learned and excellent sermon," at Paul's Cross. As to the object of this unwonted proceeding,—for there had never been such a sight in London since the time of the Spanish Armada,—every one was in the dark. Some said it was "*only* about the repairing of the Church," which had lost its steeple by fire about twenty years before: while others, thinking the alleged cause insufficient for the effect, endeavoured to persuade themselves that it was a public thanksgiving for the Prince Palatine's election to the crown of Bohemia. The repairing of the cathedral, however, was after all the object in view. When the Bishop's sermon was over, King James retired with him into his palace, where they consulted together upon the best method of raising money: but the King himself had nothing to give, and the courtiers followed the King's example, and the citizens were rather languid in their support of cathedrals about this time; so that this imposing commencement had a ridiculous termination. A commission was issued, and there the matter ended. The work was not set about in earnest until King Charles took it up, about fourteen years afterwards; and then it was that Bishop Corbet, in addressing the clergy of his diocese, told them, that although the Apostle himself did not like the *stoning* he got at Lystra, *a good stoning* was nevertheless the very thing his church in London stood most in need of.'—Pp. 89—91.

The sports with which D'Ewes entertained his leisure hours, were tennis, shovel-groat, bowls, and cards; also jumping, running, and pitching the bar, with an occasional day of fishing. Thus the time passed pleasantly enough between the Protestant divines, court gossip brought down fresh by some favoured preacher, or delivered by oral tradition through many hands, and more physical 'recreations.' Of these latter, foot-ball was, on one occasion, of considerable violence on the part of the Johnians, in which D'Ewes was luckless enough to be impli-

ated, from his accidental presence at the time. The Jol pressed their victory over the Trinity men from the legit foot-ball arena to an attack on Trinity College in ge bursting open the gates, and putting to flight all the d terrible confusion. 'But sweet meat hath sour sauce Symonds, thinking with Solomon, 'qui tangit picem, in bitur,' determined in future to avoid the 'prejudicious e of evil company, as well as the liability to a 'pecuniary i

The last chapter of this entertaining little book is devc a description of the great Commencement in 1620, and D touching farewell of Alma Mater. The Commencement his heart's content, from the opportunity it gave him of h sermons and declamations. He breakfasted early to ob good seat, and scarcely had time at noon to eat a basty before he rushed off for the same purpose a second time. he was 'fain to rest contented with an incommodious se hear the Divinity Act, in which Dr. Davenant, a learned logian of the Calvinistic school, was the Moderator, a fri Symonds the Respondent, the opponents being 'seven mencing doctors.' The profane members of the Universit meanwhile much excited by the rumour that 'a famou had arrived at the Gogmagog hills. The Vice-Chan however, stopt these 'vain and needless proceedings,' a bull had to march off.

D'Ewes was much troubled at the end of his residence University, to find that he was in debt to the college tl pounds. Holdsworth made known this to his father wl accompanied his pupil home to Stowlangtoft, and after haggling an amicable settlement was at last concluded. final valediction we must give in his own words; and wou our Universities now sent away all their sons with such of affection!

'Now approaches that gloomy, or rather that fatal day, in whic to leave my dearest Mother, of whose pure milk I have drank so months, and fed upon her daintiest bits. Though not about to fors sciences themselves, I am to depart from the patroness and fau them. Oh, shall I ever forget the hour, when my books and m things being stripped away, and my chamber mourning, as it were, want of its accustomed ornaments, my friends are now visiting me farewell! Of all these, which I have loved so well, I am even now a suffer the privation. It was the twenty-fifth day of May, in the ye that embraced my admittance; and it is this present twenty-second September, 1620, which now shadows my departure. I have just b gain strength, by the continuance of strong food, and thus am I s snatched away from it. I have tasted of the several sciences, I have not yet ascended to metaphysics or any mathematics. Thes follow, if I could have remained longer. But although many thing now departing do thus distract me, yet it is not altogether witho own consent; for when the vices of the University which I am

come into my thoughts, a sort of content is prepared thereby. So then, farewell, dear Mother!—farewell, dear Schools!—farewell, happy lectures! farewell, faithful friends!—Ye lose a son in person, though not in affection; an auditor in sense, though not in desire; a frequenter in substance, though not in circumstance; and a true well-wisher in his absent thoughts, as hitherto in his present words.'—Pp. 121, 122.

May we not gather, from this insight into Cambridge life in the reign of James I., two reflections? First, the general guidance which the tone of feeling in our Universities exercises by anticipation over the politics of the nation; and, secondly, as a deduction from this, the importance of giving to our Universities a tone that will make their influences beneficial. These are evidences that our Universities equally affect public opinion now as then, and therefore we may hope that the revival of Church doctrines, Church practices, and of the love of the Church, which now is attributed, even by means of nicknames from individual members, to the Universities of the nineteenth century, may have as much influence in the cause of the Church as the Puritan tendency we have seen in Cambridge had in bringing on the Puritan climax thirty years after.

of scenes and characters within the knowledge and acquaintance of us all, has a field which, perhaps, no other class of composition can occupy so well. Experience seems to have recognised it as the best teacher of manners. The good advice, the satire, the penetration into motives, the nice perception of character, the wide range of observation which Addison and Johnson spread over their miscellaneous essays, are now, so far as their followers possess these gifts, displayed with more power over the fancy, with a greater weight of example, with better order, and more comprehensive arrangement, in the well-planned story; thus, as we have said, constituting it the best form for conveying instruction in manners: manners in the highest sense of the word, not as deportment, but behaviour. We consider that many persons suffer in their own conduct from want of acquaintance with, and interest in fictitious scenes,—from not having been led to consider occasions of interest and excitement, and temptation, nor what is the line which ought to be pursued in them, till they find themselves in the midst of such on their personal account.

It is the province of the writer in this department of fiction to keep a watch over, to guide and restrain, the unguarded lighter moments of humanity,—those times when the conscience sees no boldly marked lines between good and ill, when especially the young and inexperienced see no dangers, when no positive course of action is laid down, no direct laws are to be observed or infringed,—when the conduct, in fact, seems left rather to the guidance of the will, than of the conscience. Then the novelist who understands his office, and the responsibilities of his (and may we not here especially say *her*?) art, steps in and tells where duty lies, what course self-denial points to; and shows how the joys and cares of our daily common life, the intercourse of society, the social circle, may be the battle-field of our trial—that we cannot get away from right and wrong—that our conduct must be either good or bad towards all with whom we come into collision—that character is forming itself for evil or for good, in the game, the dance, the song, as well as in the more formal arenas for our actions. Intercourse with society teaches external good manners. It should be the novelist's part, in Miss Austin's words, to enforce 'that higher species of self-command, that just consideration for others, that knowledge of our own heart, that principle of right,' which alone makes politeness valuable to its possessor; to illustrate in critical situations the use of the regulations and laws of society, which often seem least reasonable when they are most needed; to demonstrate that they are not to be disobeyed with impunity, and that in moments of excitement we are no judges of their importance. His work should be an epitome of the

world's experience, for the world *is* an authority, and has a court of jurisdiction, to which we must bow; interpreting the verdict of society on certain questions coming lawfully under its cognisance. It is to despising this authority when it suits our purpose, that many social errors may be traced; wherever fact, the world's judgment is despised, not because it is *wrong*, but because it is too strict. Society, when unbiassed by personal considerations, is a less lenient judge than our own heart, and it is no relaxation of restraints and checks to acknowledge the consent of mankind, uninfluenced by self, guided by experience and a sound judgment, is *intended* to be the director of daily conduct. Revelation is not given to instruct men in points on which they are competent to arrive at a correct judgment without; and, indeed, they seldom search into its pages for examples of social manners, rejecting the general opinion of their own day, except to justify themselves in a course of idleness and laxity.

In one point especially, which is the main, unfailing topic of fiction, bad and good, and which plays a very important part in the lives of some portion of most men's lives,—in all questions which relate to the growth of pure affection and its ultimate result, marriage, men are intended to guide themselves, not in their choice of an object, but in their conduct and deportment after having made it, by the world's uninspired wisdom, experience, and sense of justice. We will venture to say that few people reject its precept on these points, and appeal to the example of the characters of Scripture—(we desire to discriminate absolutely between precept and example, the one being given for all time, the other to be interpreted by the circumstances of a totally different state of society)—men seldom, we say, appeal to express Revelation as sole authority, without having some ill end to gain, without seeking for some relaxation of a stricter law, which chafes their ungoverned tempers and wishes; and this because the Bible does not supply us with examples to copy on a minute point of practice, but with general laws, and with a light whereby to interpret and refine the common sense of mankind. We have known men seriously defended for fornication after a second marriage immediately on the dissolution of their first by Scripture; and our own experience has shown us that there are no more unscrupulous, remorseless flirts, than some who would pronounce it worse than waste of time to read a novel, and who would not move in general society. The consent of the most serious and well-judging of our community, is obviously the only guide to society in its management and completion of these delicate transactions; and the digest of these decisions may be found in compendious form in the pages of our really good novelist.

such an one as Miss Austin, we would say, if asked for an example; and perhaps only in her works to the same point of sensibility and correctness: as we are well aware that the most audacious encouragements to rebellion, and contempt of all guidance but our own wills, may be found in those of the far more numerous race of bad and dangerous ones. Our aim, then, would be, in distinction from the advice we have quoted, not to dissuade young people from reading fiction—a hopeless task, and, like most hopeless tasks, an undesirable one—but to give them some rules by which to guide their taste and conscience to discriminate between the pure and the contaminating, the clear judgment and the disordered fancy, the fair copy of nature and the false caricature of it. We would not wish to deprive them of that natural aliment for their age and state of feeling which invention supplies, or of the benefit of examples, fictitious it may be, but, if true to nature, well adapted to the circumstances of their own age and condition—perhaps even more calculated to give the precise instruction they may be in need of, than the occurrences of their own actual experience; but we would see them possessed of such right judgment, purity, and generosity of feeling, as to detect and reject what is selfish, worldly, or base, in thought or expression, and to be disgusted by the low aims, the false sentiment, and vulgar pretension, which are the characteristics of too large a proportion of the works of fiction of the present, and perhaps we may say, of every day.

Nor must the natural interest for subjects of this nature, which possesses young people, be entirely set down as we elders are apt to set it down—with just enough ground not to be sufficiently alive to its unfairness—to the folly, and ‘stuff’ and nonsense, which are supposed by some to be the exclusive composition of the youthful brain. The subject, with all its concomitants, under proper restrictions, may well be interesting to the young. For, though it is very far from being the topic of main importance, or a necessary subject of thought to all, it is of great import to the majority. There is something remarkable in the consideration of its being in the order of Providence that the decision which affects the interests of a whole life must necessarily be made, in most instances, in the age of youth and an unripe judgment; when right principles and inclination, the heart and understanding, are constantly opposed to one another, with little or no help from experience. In such cases, the direction of a maturer mind, teaching under the attractive garb of example, may be often found a valuable ally to, in some cases may even be of greater service than, the more formal advice of friends; that is, the influence of the one may have prepared the mind for the trial which the other may meet only when the

temptation is in active operation. Above all, such counsels, conscientiously given, may warn against the weakness and dishonour—in some cases wickedness is not too strong a word—of trifling and indecision in such matters, and teach even the young the duty of thinking and acting for others, and of not suffering a moment's amusement or mistaken tenderness to interfere with lasting interests—showing them what is the path of duty and honour, where inclination tempts to a very opposite course.

This train of thought has been suggested by the works at the head of our article. There is a whole class of gifts and talents which would apparently miss their proper field and purpose, if fiction were to be discarded; and in this instance their exercise has been accompanied by so much right feeling, such general purity and generosity of aim, that we cannot wish them unwritten, or deny them a useful place in our literature.

Lady Emily Ponsonby—for the authorship, though unacknowledged in the title-page, is not concealed by the publisher—has at once possessed a large field of observation, and that 'good quality of observation' in herself which is necessary to make good use of it. And while she betrays an acquaintance with a more restless, unsettling, and, we will add, frivolous state of society than belongs to the commoner's homely work-a-day world, and possibly an over-lenieny for some of its peculiar faults, she yet in the main shows such ardent aspirations after a higher good—such an honourable discontent with the life of useless self-indulgence open to her own circle, and therefore too often adopted—such an appreciation of all attempts at utility, self-denial, and a defined, religious course of action, that the general tendency of her works must be good, however we may be disposed to criticism on some points.

To such moral excellences we must give the first place in our commendation, for without them her works would not fulfil the purposes we have assigned to fiction; without the further qualities of sustained interest, well-drawn characters, a knowledge of human nature, and acquaintance with society, these higher merits would be of no avail, for they are essential to a book's being read at all by minds of any discrimination or intelligence,—by readers capable of being favourably influenced by anything they read. Works of the lowest intellectual order may do harm; but a novel must be clever, as well as well-intentioned, to do good; and Lady Emily Ponsonby's stories have merits of this class quite high enough for such a purpose. Open as they are to criticism, betraying carelessness, mannerism, want of skill in composition, and some graver charges, they still possess what is at once the essential and the crowning charm; the power of interesting and sustaining the attention.

The author, by the force of her own feeling, the intensity with which she realizes what she desires to describe, carries her readers along with her. They enter into her scenes, and care for her personages very often against their natural tastes and likings, because their sympathies are really awakened, and they willingly give themselves to her guidance.

It is now some time since the appearance of 'The Discipline of Life,' a series of three stories which for their earnestness of feeling, the vividness of some scenes, the energetic unshrinking seriousness with which the tenderer sentiments of our nature are dwelt upon and justified, and the evident genuineness as well as talent of the writer, made a considerable impression. These were followed by a second series, bearing the title of 'Pride and Irresolution,' which hardly sustained the expectation raised by the first; and, lastly, we have 'Clare Abbey,' which we must consider in many respects the best. The best, we think, both from inspiring a deeper interest, from the happy and original delineation of the heroine's character, and from the absence or modification of certain faults conspicuous in the others,—seen especially in some attempts to chasten the style, naturally turbid, excited, and given to the unrestrained use of traditionary stock phrases; which, however efficacious once in stirring sympathy, have been blunted long ago by too general and indiscriminate an application.

It is not our intention, however, to dwell upon these works separately, (which would carry us beyond our limits,) but rather to point out what have appeared to us some of the characteristic excellences and faults of their author. We have already spoken of the general purity of their aim, but the impulse of composition has been evidently too strong to allow it to be supposed of them that they were written with the formal purpose of doing good (a motive which should not be too prominent even in the mind of an author of fiction, and much less should be conspicuous in his pages); but they are quite as likely to be useful as if this had been the only avowed end, and they had not been written under the same impulse to express what is vividly seen and felt, which directs the poet and the workers in all arts,—the true instinct of invention. This applies, we should say, only to certain scenes and certain characters which we conclude stood broadly and prominently before the author's mind, while all the rest of the story was in chaos rather than in embryo. How to bring these characters and scenes within the bounds of a consistent plot has probably been a task unassisted by such intention, and often in the result betrays difficulty and unsuccessful labour. But pictures and scenes which the heart has been in commend themselves to the reader with the force

of a vivid imagination. The writer has the success and reward which has led her on. We sympathise with her, see as she sees, and feel as she would have us; and our sympathies as a whole have not been betrayed, they have been excited commonly in a good cause,—in the triumph of the higher over the lower nature, in the conquest of self, or in the portraying of pure as well as ardent feeling. Her works show a mind genuinely dissatisfied with that tone of selfish ease which is the necessary danger of hereditary wealth, rank, and leisure, and a laudable wish to emancipate herself, and it may be others, from this ‘lotus-eater’s spell.

Of the society open to these insidious dangers our authoress shows a very wide acquaintance. She has a large range in her own peculiar field of observation. Out of this magic circle her acquaintance with manners is nothing; and her substitute for personal knowledge, books, or merely fancy: but in fashionable society she is thoroughly at home, and we recognise a very quick and lively perception. She reports well the tone of general conversation; her characters speak with graceful ease, and if we find nothing to deserve the name of wit in the most rigorous sense of the word, there is often a liveliness and readiness of remark and rejoinder which almost approaches to it, and supplies its place. She can make ladies and gentlemen, the ‘persons of quality’ of old times, talk very much as they really do when they talk their best: there is a refinement and gentleness about them, a facility of expression, and often an ease and *abandon*, which the consciousness of being in the privileged circles, and so above criticism, is calculated to produce. Especially she is successful in reporting a tone of easy, careless, good-natured, unthinking prosperity. Mrs. Vivian Herve, one of the characters in ‘*Pride*,’ who is unpretendingly introduced as simply a silly woman, is an example of this success, and though weak and frivolous forms, we must confess, a very agreeable contrast to the wearisome and insufferable pride of the heroine. Nor does this facility in any sense degrade her stories to the rank of ‘the fashionable novel.’ She writes what is natural to her of the world which has been her world, to the exclusion of all others. The details of wealth and consequence, which, when given, always betray a rare and chance acquaintance with them, are implied, not talked about. Grand titles and fine rooms are taken for granted: we are spared the recapitulation of French dishes and fine company.

But while we accept her report of the manners of her own circle, we must protest against the impression which seems established in her mind, that all the graces and refinements of life are confined to it, and that all excluded from its influence

are vulgar,—commit overt acts of bad manners. People are always ready to suppose this of the class below them. There is a gradation no doubt of elegance and polish, but in the class where our highborn authoress sees the lowest step, we can assure her that there does still exist some self-restraint and self-respect. The daughters of merchants, attorneys, and surgeons do not as a body behave as she represents them to do. Gossip and lovers are temptations to talk incident to humanity, but these proscribed circles do not abandon themselves to the indulgence of these topics with so little sense of propriety, so little regard to time or place or deportment, as they are supposed to do. They do not quarrel, or recriminate, or taunt, or envy one another, in quite so loud a key; nor do they necessarily talk loud at all, nor spend the morning looking out of window, (sometimes hanging half out, for such is the charge,) commenting on their neighbour's proceedings, and counting up the callers and the movements of the new curate.

While we willingly grant to the aristocracy an air and manner which perhaps no other circle can produce, we must claim for all the educated classes of the present day an almost equal immunity from the extremes of vulgarity and impropriety of behaviour. Vulgar people there are, and we suppose always will be,—no circle, however distinguished, is without them; but we hold them to be as much an outrage on the tastes and habits of the middle classes as of the highest,—that is, the fault lies as much in themselves, in the uncontrollable impertinence, presumption, and meanness of their own minds, which must break out in an appropriate manner, and as little in the example set them by the society they move in.

But this we are willing to believe is a fault of ignorance rather than of intention; there is nothing in the general spirit of these books contemptuous or supercilious. The tone of sincere religious feeling is indeed a sort of guarantee for this, and of this we may speak in terms of warmer approval than the treatment of this subject in most fictions can draw from us. There is throughout a prevailing sense, so real that it is imparted to the reader, of this life being a scene of trial and probation—a something transitory and imperfect, whose end is in another existence. Whatever is written, not by rote but from the heart, of the claims of duty upon us all, of the dangers of ease and luxury, of the real uses of wealth and influence, must be useful in spite of some mistakes in the mode of infusing these principles; and of the sincerity of the writer on these points, there is no question. Perhaps the error which strikes us most forcibly in her mode of introducing higher views and aims than belong to society at large, is the use she makes of the clerical

office—attributable, we suspect, quite as much to mismanage and bungling in her art as to design. It is not Lady E. Ponsonby's gift to bring in anything incidentally, nor to de thought and opinion by any but the most direct modes of munication. In real life, we find out people's views in all of indirect informal ways, and the novelist, master of his t leaves us to do the same by his characters. But her persor work upon one another in the most obvious and direct mode the simple plan of question and answer. Now for the amel tion of mankind she sees two, and but two, engines—Reli and the influence of the affections.

To begin with the last :—Love, it must be confessed, pla prominent part in her world. She has no shrinkings or res on the subject ; it is natural for men and women to fall in and hers all do. We do not really quarrel with this, for her is of a very poetical, immaterial order ; but few novelists ver to give it so wide a control over the mind of man. ' The sta more beholden to love than the life of man,' says Bacon ; authoress's stage is certainly deeply beholden to it ; probably would dispute the cold-hearted axiom altogether, but she love a power and supremacy in her ideal world which at we do not see to prevail in real life, however much it may a secret springs of action. Her reliance in the extent and un sality of its influence is truly unbounded. Men of the world responsibilities upon them, and family claims, with a charact support and engagements to meet, think nothing of aband them all at a moment's notice on a disappointment of the a tions, and as suddenly, when hope revives, resuming these carded duties. Nor is it only one or two who are thus engre by this passion ; the whole world, as represented in these volu are alike its slaves. In the first story we have an excellent y clergyman twice its victim, and twice, we are sorry to equally out of luck ; we have the veritable hero, just ele member of parliament too, rushing off to the antipodes in of ungovernable, and we think very uncalled for, despair ; we the heroine, by an unfortunate entanglement, arising from knowing her own mind, engaged in two affairs at once ; be to the earth, a crushed flower, a broken lily, tearful, despair The trifling, the deep, the self-denying, the self-indulgent alike caught in the inextricable trammels. It is the stren ener of weakness, the medicine of despair, the soother of di tent, the subduer of pride, the controller of bad-temper. views of love being of this absorbing, engrossing character, its influence for good second only to religion itself, it is think, an error to choose to exhibit many of its greatest of power and conquest upon members of the clerical profess

and much the more because her views of the clerical office are high. She cannot forget, or let her readers forget, that the despairing lover is a Priest of the Church, invested with high spiritual powers.

It is, we think, a serious mischief to turn clergymen into heroes, that is, heroes of love stories. Clergymen marry, and therefore, no doubt, fall in love. There is no objection to their doing so. No one sees much of young curates, in necessary social intercourse with their flock, without thinking it desirable in the case of most of them, that they should marry; they are more useful in their vocation for being settled, unless possessed of some remarkable qualities which place them above, or independent of, general rules. In ordinary town and country society the clergyman is generally the best educated man of the circle, the one best calculated for rational agreeable talk with women; the one, for many good reasons, they naturally look up to; the one about whom *therefore* gossip most freely circulates; and whom silly people of both sexes take under the guardianship of their constant surveillance. For, his office being a public one, unless personally insignificant, he is brought before public observation; he is a subject of natural interest and discussion, supposing there are any points in him which sanction such a distinction—they need not be very high ones to compass so much fame;—and women are invariably attracted by prominence and distinction; it is well, therefore, that in reasonable time the object of so much notice and interest should be left to the discharge of his duties undisturbed either by his own wishes for a more comfortable sympathising home than his dreary lodgings afford, or by the interpretation his actions may receive amongst persons who have leisure and inclination to concern themselves with his affairs. But it is only fanning the flame of this mischievous excitement, to make this situation a field for romantic invention, to instruct young people in the difficulties of the position, the contests of feeling, the conflicting claims of human and divine affections, of the mere man and his sacred office,—to represent the new curate or his interesting young rector as led away, falling into the sweet toils of some enchanting member of his flock. And the more discreetly they are represented as concealing these conflicts, the more harm does the picture do. For the discretion and indifference of the Rector of real life is deprived of its due weight by the apparent parallel qualities in his counterpart in story, who conceals so skilfully, by the austere arts of a severe manner, the smouldering fire within. For these and other obvious reasons, we object to the difficulties of their high vocation being made a subject for the entanglements of fiction. The scenes which represent them will do the young ladies harm

and the young parsons no good. They must derive lessons of conduct from higher sources, as their calling is a higher one: and the loftier and more religious the tone assumed, the more the dignity of the office is enlarged upon, the more we feel this objection; the especial mischief, we fear, is indeed not incurred unless the profession is exalted and dwelt upon, and the acts it leads to brought out. Miss Austin has young clergymen amongst her characters, but she does not feel it her duty to depict the clerical character. Even in the case where she makes the dulness and gravity of the profession, its *unfashionable* aspect, a difficulty with her brilliant, clever, worldly Mary Crawford, she avoids touching on its true spiritual character, and does not allow us to see her conscientious young clergyman actually at work in the scene of his labours. We have no descriptions of sermons, no charges from the young ladies of *severity*, no professional reproofs and exhortations, no sacerdotal benedictions, when the natural feelings are at their height of excitement. The admirable novelist we have quoted is often blamed as if she had a low view of the clerical office: this may or may not have been true, though we believe her to have been beyond her age even here; but we are convinced that the cause of social morality is much better served by not venturing on subjects which are above the sphere of fiction at all, than by introducing them with whatever degree of reverent and orthodox treatment.

While we have dwelt upon this fault, we are yet, as we have said, tempted to attribute it in part to the difficulty this writer evidently labours under, of bringing out her principles or delineating her characters. Her only notion seems to be the very simple one of making them, on their first introduction to the reader and to each other, explain formally and distinctly their views either of life or of themselves; a plan very contrary to nature, for certainly the majority of mankind,—those not given to metaphysical discussion,—never explain at all, to any one, at any time,—never even clear up to themselves, what are their principles of action or their expectations from life. But in these stories it matters not what varieties there are of character and circumstances, all agree in this clear and defined knowledge of themselves, their faults, their wishes, sensations and opinions, especially in the most interesting of all subjects, and this expressed with little difficulty or reserve, on a first interview, or the first occasion where such a confidence is possible, and a congenial spirit is met with. As an example, in the story of 'The Moat' we have a very reserved character, Sarah, the unamiable, ill-tempered sister, (in whom we see a resemblance to some of Miss Bremer's creations,) who never till now has spoken to any one of her feelings, holding the

following conversation on the very first occasion of being alone with the high-minded, self-denying, self-condemning hero of the piece, and thus frankly describing herself:—

‘She went on more vehemently, “You cannot know, you cannot conceive, half my misery! My heart is cold, my temper is harsh. I am full of envy and hatred, and suspicion; all, everybody seems to me to be false. Their smooth words irritate me—I love none, and none love me. Like a freezing winter’s day, I chill all who approach me, and I am cold and miserable myself.” It was the long pent-up agony of years that was bursting from her lips; reserve, distrust, all was forgotten; she felt as if she was pouring out her griefs into the ears of an angel.

‘Claude looked at her with his kindest, gentlest expression, but he answered her very gravely, “I cannot deny that some part of what you say is true.”’

They discuss her bad temper, ‘and with a strange calmness’ his words sunk into the depths of her soul. “Why do you not ‘love more, Miss Woodville; you say you love *none*?’” Then he goes on to define what love he means:—

“It is to forget yourself; it is to live in and for some happiness—some life besides your own.” She walked breathless, agitated, her heart beating, by his side; she felt that it was come; self was departing; she was beginning to live in another only.—*Discipline of Life*, vol. iii. p. 198.

After this the evil temper was subdued, it ‘was easy with’ worship, with devotion, with idolatry, to look up to Claude ‘Hastings. She needed nothing more: she loved him, and was ‘at peace.’ We must hold it fortunate that young gentlemen and young ladies do not naturally fall into such very confidential discourse. Good advice must not only be good in itself, but in the circumstances and the giver; all must be appropriate, or more harm than good will come of the administration.

This, however, we own to be an extreme case of our authoress’s practice; but there are near approaches to it in every story. The subject of love, or things bearing closely upon it, seldom escapes being discussed beyond the second or third meeting. Witness Herbert Gray’s and Isabel’s opening conversation; and again in ‘Clare Abbey,’ where the artless Camilla, engaging as she always is, talks with Ernest de Gray, and on still more delicate ground with Mr. Hargrave; with whom, on their first acquaintance, she discusses the power of love, and they mutually talk of themselves; on which occasion, being set to make himself particularly agreeable, five minutes have not passed before he is repeating part of the confession out of the Prayer Book, and analysing his own degree of wickedness; and, indeed, this model of tact seems as if he could not get away from himself,—whether he is consistent or not,—whether he is changed or not, &c. In the ‘Country Neighbours,’ the Colonel, another interesting man of the world,

who treacherously proposes by turns to both heroines, recommends himself to each on their opening acquaintance by professions of selfishness. 'Self-denial and self-forgetfulness says he, 'the virtues I most prize, and, I am afraid I must the least practise.' The cold, calm Clarice, in her turn, confides to him her wish to be a Sister of Charity, and enters into an abstract discussion with him, (for the ladies are must say, most innocently blind to the tendencies of what say,) on the dangers of giving the mind up to earthly and the too much happiness it would bring. We allow things in fiction from the tacit allowance we make for difficulties of authorship; they would prejudice us for ever really heard from any one freshly introduced to our acquaintance. There are people to whom such talking is natural suits well with Julian and Florence, in that uncomfortable of 'Irresolution;' but it is not natural, we are glad to for girls of sixteen or seventeen to have such subjects at fingers' ends, except, perhaps, in the vague form in which really pretty character, Evelyn Villars, expresses her expectations and views of matrimony, as—

'That some day, perhaps, she rather hoped that somebody nice like her very much indeed, and if they did, why then she thought most likely that she should like them, and then, she supposed, married.'

But it is seldom her young ladies are content with such reasoning expectations. Camilla in 'Clare Abbey,' though we have said, the most attractive and original of our author's female characters, and though she expresses herself with an engaging, child-like cleverness, goes beyond nature, and is rigid, beyond absolute propriety in the topics she chooses. that we really bring this charge, for we must attribute would in real life be forwardness, to a simple want of skill in the novelist, only we should be sorry to find the young girls of our own acquaintance so very *au fait* on matters which could properly only reach them by the slow processes of cultivation and experience.

It is a remarkable feature in these stories, that though the writer gives to the tenderer feelings so prominent a place in books, and seeks to engage our interest for them by her unusual powers of pathos and passion, she will never allow her real unalloyed content in witnessing their natural consummation in fruition in a satisfactory wedding. We object to this system for two reasons: the one, on the story-lover's ground, that after he followed the fortunes and sympathised with the griefs and plexities of the heroine, as we are expected to do, we have right to be made comfortable on her account at the last;

another for critical reasons. Marriages, we may say, are seldom, and ought never to be, disfigured by the discomforts and anomalies they are here surrounded with. They have their drawbacks, but not the sort of horrors and disturbing associations she delights to give them. We will take the stories seriatim. In 'Isabel Denison,' no Clergyman satisfied the writer for performing the ceremony but Herbert, the rival lover, a 'blighted being' through the piece, and a great marplot, we must think, at the wedding; but here we will leave the reader to judge. First a sympathising observer notes the 'unnatural paleness of his cheek,' and 'a strange compressed look about the mouth, and a voice that wrung the heart by its sadness.' Then—

'As he stood for an instant in the door-way, his eyes fell on Isabel in her bridal dress. She was looking strangely beautiful,—with her down-cast eyes, and marble cheeks, and long flowing veil, more like an angel from heaven than a bride on earth. For an instant Herbert turned away his face, drew a deep breath, then again looked calmly upon her, and led the way to the altar.'

A person whose wound is still so raw and green has no right to disturb others' feelings by such a display of his own. But throughout in these volumes, the feelings of the heart are always reflected with scarcely any interposing veil of self-command upon the countenance, and faces are read with precisely the same ease and accuracy as books. In the next story, that of the 'Country Neighbours,' the marriage service is performed by the death-bed of the bridegroom's little daughter, at her particular and preposterous request. We are thus left to the dilemma of deciding which impropriety the bereaved father will be guilty of,—forgetting his child on the day of her death, or his wife on the day of her marriage, though we suppose there need be no real doubt how it would be determined, where people choose to put their grief to so unnatural a test. In 'The Moat,' the happiness of the heroine is simply marred by the consciousness of her marriage causing the wretchedness of two individuals,—her quondam lover and her sister. In the next series the distress arises in each story from physical causes. In 'Irresolution' the bride marries her scapegrace of a lover, *because* she has ascertained from her physician that she can't live a month; while in 'Pride' the hero is the sufferer, and does not prevail over the ridiculous scruples of the object of his affections, till he is so far gone in decline as to survive his marriage but a short time. In 'Clare Abbey,' this habit is not so far overcome but that, though we are at ease as to the constitution and stamina of the parties, we are yet dispirited by the depression and gloom of all concerned, the very recent death of the leading character forbidding all outward signs of joy, and

which blazes out on the spectator as it walks along the highway, and astonishes and vanquishes by its own unassisted power, in only a momentary glance; and they are as accomplished as they are beautiful. Arts which require labour and maturity of mind are complete in them at seventeen or eighteen; girls of this age make drawings full of beauty and genius, and play with intensity of feeling, and an individuality, which leaves the master's teaching far behind. This is a mistake; we do not like them the better for these impossibilities: no girl's genius for drawing is developed at this age,—no girls of seventeen play with impassioned fervour. It requires years and womanhood to show much character in these arts, or if otherwise, the precocity unfits them for their office; they are artists, not heroines. Nor does the excess of accomplishment please us in the very young; promise is all we desire for them—promise and feeling. Ignorance and imperfection are anything but drawbacks; for one of the charms of youth lies in its lying within the compass of our patronage and approval; and great early proficiency in one art can hardly be attained without betraying an exclusive regard for it, and application which cannot have been bestowed but at the expense of something else.

It may possibly be owing to this undue respect for distinctions which attract general attention, that our authoress shows so remarkable a leniency towards the error of pride. She has clearly a sort of liking for it. She thinks it a fine thing—a quality which belongs to great minds; she expects sympathy for it in others. Not that, in words, she would treat it otherwise than as a sin, but that she will not see the low elements from which it springs; she is mistaken as to its origin and genealogy. In 'Clare Abbey,' in which we note an improvement generally, her Reginald is proud, but overcomes it, and confesses his error before he dies; but in her earlier story, which assumes 'Pride' for its title, her tenderness towards the lowest form of this vice is something not to be understood. Her 'Ada' is literally composed of pride. She is as flagrant an example of it as Cinderella's sisters, and yet we are clearly expected to admire her. It is conspicuous, like theirs, in a lofty carriage, in raised eye-brows, and frowns and scornful words. Her conversations begin with a 'shade of haughtiness,' are carried on with 'increasing haughtiness,' and are finished 'coldly, as well as haughtily.' She spoils social cheerfulness by bringing in her 'careless coldness,' and 'proud calmness,' entirely out of place, and makes herself so habitually disagreeable, that an act of the commonest good-nature takes the bystanders by surprise. Nor does the writer shrink from the consequences of this failing; she makes it produce worldliness,

loss of natural affection, selfishness, and falsehood. Her heroine, a girl of eighteen, willingly engages herself to a stupid heavy man, simply and knowingly because he is an earl, and has forty thousand a-year, all the while being conscious of a preference for another person; and yet the authoress can bestow such expressions as 'lofty,' and 'clear,' and 'pure,' upon this state of mind, and lavish pains and unnecessary detail, as if her task were a pleasant and congenial one. It is as though she were to take thirty years off the life of Miss Austin's excellent but very contrary impersonation of Pride, Lady Catharine de Burgh, (no doubt well known to our readers,) and make a heroine of her. We need not say that a character so interesting to the writer is not allowed to remain under its incrustation. Misfortune comes to break down the dream of rank, wealth, and consequence; and in administering this necessary correction, our authoress is so intent upon giving suddenness and force to the blow,—so engrossed, in fact, upon her ideal,—that she forgets all probability or nature in the instruments that are to effect it, and so gives a harshness, and almost impossibility to scenes and situations, led up to with great feeling and descriptive skill. It is thus that Ada's uncle, a warm-hearted amiable man, breaks the change of her prospects to his niece:—

'Your father is ruined!—he has lost all—lost more than fortune—he has been guilty of dishonourable practices; he has disgraced his name, and been forced to fly. All is over—your marriage is broken off—you have nothing, Ada—you are a beggar!'

And in the same way the powerful scene in 'Clare Abbey,' which describes the end of all poor Reginald's ambitious hopes, is marred by a similar flagrant departure from nature and custom. If there is a class of men cautious and guarded from respect at once to their patient's welfare and their own reputation, it is that of physicians; yet, on the first investigation of his accident, they are not content with pronouncing on his immediate state, and the exigency of the present hour, but commit themselves to a prophecy of months of pain which death only can relieve; all of which is conveyed to the unfortunate sufferer, for whose sake, indeed, as being supposed to need such rough discipline and with grandeur of character to profit by it, the authoress has thus unscrupulously sacrificed the credit of the medical profession. Nor are we quarrelling about trifles. The happy effect in some complete work of art of general harmony and consistency, can hardly be exaggerated in giving reality to the whole, and force to the more impressive parts. We are wrapped in a little world of the author's own making, and nothing comes to break the spell. But where there is failure in these

points, where the by-play is ill kept up, the illusion is constantly broken in scenes of the highest interest; and 'this cannot really be,' and 'this need not have happened so,' disturb us like the waking doubt which breaks in on some morning dream.

It is one of the inevitable perversities of criticisms, that where praise and blame are to be distributed, however the balance leans, the blame must take all the time in the telling, from the fact, that it is natural to praise in general terms, and to find fault in detail. When a scene is happily given, vividly, with quickness of observation, experience of character, and a right judgment, we say so; we acknowledge the pleasure and interest it has excited in us, and give the author credit for his success, but all this is soon said. It is difference and disagreement that are the consumers of time. When there are mistakes either of principle or execution to be asserted, the matter cannot be settled so readily; it sounds dogmatical and dictatorial to find fault without a reason, and the flood-gates are open for unlimited discussion, on something the same principle that there is but one way of doing right, and a thousand of doing wrong. We are sensible of having fallen, in the present instance, into this inevitable injustice. But for this, we would gladly cavil a little longer, and inquire, for example, what attraction a thoughtful conscientious writer could find in so weak a character as her Julian in 'Irresolution,' and how she could make her favourite Susan share her lenient views, and break so many wise resolutions for so worthless a fellow? while, on his side, we would plead, whether it was not a little hard to make his wife's *life* depend on his good behaviour, and to punish every act of misbehaviour on his part by the breaking of a blood-vessel on hers? As men are constituted, this is hard justice. It is an unnatural trial of their constancy and affection, and, happily, one to which we are none of us exposed in so direct and immediate a degree. But ask questions of this sort as succinctly as we can, they yet take a great deal more time than to state the counterbalancing merits of even this, the least agreeable story of the series—the conscientiousness of poor Susan contrasting so happily with the weak waverings of her lover—her sweetness, with the aunt's ill-humour—her sense, with the poetical imbecility of her father—her humility and self-denial, with the vain selfishness so well depicted in her rival Florence.

It has not been part of our design to discuss these tales in detail, yet some concluding words we must give to 'Clare Abbey,' as being the last from our authoress's pen, and, as we have said, the best. While it is in a degree open to the same objections as her previous works, its merits are of a higher order; the plot better planned and sustained; the dialogue more

lively and flowing; the feeling deeper; the religious sentiment more pervading, and the delineation of the principal characters most happy and effective, both in her attractions, her weakness and the errors to which they naturally lead. It is the fashion now, for lack of more discriminating praise, to compare female writers on domestic manners with Miss Austin. We are never disposed to offer this compliment. No one, to our mind, writes at all like Miss Austin, except in the way of direct imitation; but our authoress needs no unmeaning distinction of this kind; she has merits of her own, which make her independent of comparisons, and give her a permanent hold on our interest and no inconsiderable standing in the lighter literature of the day.

ART. IV.—*The History of S. Cuthbert, or an Account of his Life, Decease, and Miracles; of the Wanderings of his Body at intervals during 124 Years; of the State of his Body from his Decease until A.D. 1542, and of the various Monuments erected to his Memory. By the Very Rev. Monsignor C. EYRE, Chamberlain of Honour to His Holiness Pope Pius IX.; Incumbent of St. Mary's Church, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Member of the Archæological Institute, etc. London: Burns. 1849.*

' TIME doth transfix the flourish set on youth,
And delves the parallels in beauty's brow,
Feeds on the rarities of nature's truth,
And nothing stands but for his scythe to mow.'

So sings the greatest poet in the world, in strains that throw a grace and beauty around the tritest subject. *Kaίpoς ὁ πανδαμάτωρ* has, no doubt, been a schoolboy theme ever since there were schoolboys. But perhaps the Anglo-Saxon period with its kings and saints is remarkable beyond others for the greatness of the reputations enjoyed at one time by its celebrated men, and the utter oblivion into which they are now sunk. Who but the few students of the Anglo-Saxon language and chronicles knows anything of S. Edwin or S. Oswald, or the whole series of canonized kings and queens which the Saxon Church produced? Names once great in England—household words in large districts—are utterly unknown; characters once familiarly understood, enshrined in the love and veneration of a whole people, now utterly forgotten—their very existence, as in the case of S. Bega and others, almost matter of controversy. Even of those whose names remain familiar to us, and whose fame was greatest and most widely spread, there seems but little to be told; and history, where we can arrive at it, affords but scanty justification to tradition.

We know, indeed, that the popularity of saints in all ages has been regulated by no fixed laws, and men have been content in this as in lower matters to be guided by the chance influences of fashion or fancy. Of two saints apparently equally entitled to the reverence of posterity, we often find one neglected and the other followed with exaggerated honours. Often, indeed, at least in modern times, and in another communion, the greatest are disregarded, while no care is thought too much for some comparatively new and insignificant name. At Rome itself the old church on the island, which has inscribed outside, *In hac*

Basilica requiescit corpus S. Bartholomæi Apostoli, remains late and neglected; while the shrine of *S. Philumena* is continually crowded with devotees, and covered with offerings.

This is not always so, however. Fashion and merit often go together, and occasionally, by a kind of instinct, men are made out in the annals of the Church as commanding unusual respect who are really worthy of all honour, as the greatest men of all times, the types of their kind, the landmarks of history. To the man of the world, to the mere intellectualist, these men are objects for careful and deferential study. Their characters have an historical value; many of their qualities are such as command sympathy with all who are in earnest about anything; and their religious belief and devotional practices the philosopher may find matter for profound and solemn speculation. In other bodies, the Church, too, has its heroes, who stand forth as the representatives of periods, and embody each a separate and perhaps a very opposite, element of her marvellous and complicated organization. Such was S. Columban—such S. Willibrord—such S. Wulstan among ourselves. Abroad we feel that the lives of S. Bernard, of Francis of Assisi, and Ignatius Loyola, have an importance and meaning beyond that of mere biographies, and if rightly written would be little less than histories of their contemporary Church.

Such a life also was that of S. Cuthbert. The Anglo-Saxon Church produced no greater name. One of its earliest saints, living in times when paganism was still full of activity,—and a contemporary of S. Augustine—he attained a celebrity and a veneration scarcely earned by any one in succeeding ages. Nearly one hundred churches bore his name, in each of which, probably, there was some chapel or some altar especially dedicated to his honour. From the hills of Northumberland to the marshes of Somersetshire S. Cuthbert's churches bore witness to his sanctity throughout the length and breadth of England. Of the North, however, he was the especial patron. There he was regarded with feelings in which a sort of personal affection was blended with reverence for his character. He was on his own, and no endowment seemed too large, no magnificence too great, for the depth and fervour of their love. There he held the patrimony of S. Cuthbert, which for ages claimed and retained many important privileges from the sovereigns: there was the banner of S. Cuthbert, brought forth only upon the most solemn occasions, and never known to be subjected to the dishonour of defeat; there was the Cross of S. Cuthbert, a peculiar and graceful form of this sacred emblem; there was the cathedra

¹ See Webb's *Continental Ecclesiology*, p. 94.

of S. Cuthbert, one of the grandest in the kingdom; and the shrine of S. Cuthbert, one of the most beautiful and splendid of the mediæval chantries.

The life of such a man must be worth inquiring into; and as the Venerable Bede and others have been unusually full in their narrative of what relates to him, not only the man himself, but the way in which he was regarded, and the fashion of the biographies of those days, come under consideration. We learn what a time it was in many ways, when we know that this was its greatest saint. It would be weak and foolish to shrink from such a subject. A man's faith must be indeed ill-founded who cannot afford to look facts boldly in the face, and consider with fairness and honesty the history of an age gone by. Neither should it be approached in an uncandid or disrespectful spirit. Sneers and mockery are wasted upon the men of the seventh century, but may be very mischievous to ourselves. Their ways were not as our ways. Their idea of sanctity involved for the most part an austere asceticism, extreme it may be in degree, and too little tolerant of the joys and courtesies of social and domestic life. But their saints were at least thoroughly in earnest: all their lives long they kept the other world before their view, shrunk from no hardship, fled from no suffering, sacrificed every tie, to do what they believed was God's will, and to increase what they thought was His glory and honour. It is not for us to judge or to condemn them. Pioneers of civilization in the rudest wilderness, depositaries of what little learning and refinement there was in those fierce times, they are fairly entitled to the respectful curiosity of an age whose manners are softer and whose intellect far more cultivated. Considered with regard to their advantages, their achievements were wonderful; and even positively what we know of them, whether from their own works or the writings of biographers and historians, will in many respects bear the test of severe modern criticism. The lives of many of the Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical saints were spent in the most active and practical exertion; and some of the canonized kings, such as Edwin and Oswald, were models of wise and magnificent Christian rulers. In many ways the age, when we come to look into it, (as perhaps is the case with all periods,) is far more like our own than we are generally inclined to think. Not, indeed, that the life of S. Cuthbert himself can be in any sense called modern. Its simplicity, its fearful rigour, and the uncompromising reality of its practice, whatever we may think of the feeling by which that practice was directed, all these things stamp upon it the character of antiquity, carry us back twelve hundred years, and bring us into contact with a set of

ideas and a race of men differing greatly in more than mere external matters from those which surround us now.

In the year 650 a young shepherd lad might have been seen tending a flock on the sloping sides of one of the Northumbrian hills. It was in the present Roxburghshire, and not far from the abbey of Melrose. His countenance was beautiful, his body well proportioned, his manners winning. He was an orphan. In his youthful sports with his companions he had excelled them all; his boyish spirits had been high; his strength great; his love of play indomitable. At eight years old, Bede tells us he had received a solemn call to a holier and higher life. A little child bade him cease from playing, and wept when he persisted, saying that it was unworthy of one called hereafter to be a sacred bishop in the Church of God. The lad obeyed the call, and strove henceforward to lead a monastic life, though he had not determined as yet actually to enter into the monastic state. His endeavours after what he thought perfection were successful: tokens of God's favour continually attended him. One of his limbs became diseased, and an angel told him how it should be healed. A fearful storm threatened destruction to some charitable monks, who were endeavouring to succour some distressed vessels amidst the jeers and derision of the people on the beach, with whom their life and teaching were unpopular. The boy knelt down and prayed earnestly, and the storm was stilled, to the relief of the monks, and the confusion of the people, who began to look upon him as 'not in the roll of common men.' Still he went on feeding sheep till his fifteenth year, distinguished only from other shepherds by the gravity of his demeanour and the fervour of his piety. On lonely mountain tops, after a Divine example, he used to spend whole nights in prayer. One night he was thus occupied on a hill that overlooks the river Leader, when he saw a heavenly vision. The skies opened, and amidst a glorious company of angels chanting triumphant melodies, he beheld a soul of exceeding brightness and beauty pass upwards and enter into heaven. He aroused his companions and told them of his vision; and a few days afterwards they heard that S. Aidan, the holy Bishop of Lindisfarne, had died that night.

This, according to Bede, was the turning-point of S. Cuthbert's life; he at least was thoroughly persuaded of the reality of his vision, and believed that it revealed to him that he was called to follow S. Aidan in his life here, if he hoped to join him and share his happiness in the world to come. He no longer hesitated, and at the age of fifteen, attracted by the fame of Boisil the prior, he presented himself at the original monastery of Mailros—which stood on a rich lawn all but encircled by the

Tweed, about two miles below the present abbey—and was admitted to the tonsure by the Abbot Eata.

He soon became an ornament of the monastery, and was believed to be a special object of Divine favour. Bede tells us that angels visited him, that flames were quenched by his prayers, diseases healed with his touch, devils cast out at his approach, and he and his companions more than once miraculously supplied with food. The north of England was then a waste and desert country, and the journeys from one habitation to another were longer than men could go without provision, even though, like S. Cuthbert, they were used to fasts which men now-a-days would think unpleasantly prolonged. Parts of the coast, too, were then utterly unpeopled; so that on several occasions these extraordinary supplies were, no doubt, extremely welcome, and, indeed, so very necessary, that men might almost be excused for esteeming miraculous what we should more modestly call providential.

When he was about five-and-twenty, he was nearly dying of an epidemic which afflicted his native district; and although he recovered, he suffered for the remainder of his life from internal pains which never left him. Nevertheless, his temper was never ruffled, and his activity and power of endurance were never lessened. All men loved him, his superiors and inferiors alike; and the awe with which he was regarded was due rather to the holiness of his character than the severity of his manners. His favourite study was S. John's Gospel, a book he had learned to love from his friend and patron Boisil; the last week of whose life, when he knew that he was dying, had been spent in reading and meditating upon it in company with Cuthbert. Preaching to the people in the wildest parts of Northumbria was his constant occupation. Days and sometimes weeks he would be absent from Melrose, going from hovel to hovel, collecting a few poor shepherds on hill sides, baptizing in valleys, preaching amidst rocks, feeding on the coarsest fare, sharing all the hardships of that poor people, attaching them to him by the sweetness of his teaching, his unwearied devotion, his unflinching charity. He did not fast from meat, except at stated times, for fear of breaking down his health and impairing his usefulness; but he drank no wine, and in other respects—with a strange inconsistency—he subjected his body to such tremendous discipline as hardly any frame could sustain, and under which his own gave way too soon. Whole nights he passed in the sea, up to his neck in water, singing the Psalter and praying to God. For days and nights together he denied himself any sleep; and when all other occupations failed to keep off drowsiness, he steadily perambulated the island of Lindisfarne, still

reciting prayers and singing hymns. What wonder that strange stories were current of such a man as this; that miracles were believed to be wrought by the power of his holiness; that the brute creation were thought to bear witness to a sanctity more than human; eagles to feed him; seals to fall down before him; the shy and timid wildfowl (still called S. Cuthbert's ducks) to permit his approach without alarm, and live unscared by his constant presence? In some sense, he was all things to all men. He was the most ascetic of monks in a day when asceticism was followed with undue honour. He was the gentlest teacher and the wisest counsellor to men who either disliked or feared the ordinary monastic character. Unequalled in all the exercises of his monastery, he disarmed the envy of his brethren by his unfeigned humility; and the statesmen and men of the world could not but respect one who left his monastery at the call of more directly active work, and laboured night and day to civilize and elevate a rude and ignorant population. Playful, tender-hearted, considerate, sincerely and profoundly devotional, yet wise and practical when there was occasion for counsel or for action, no wonder that his fame spread far and wide, and that all men took him for a saint; princesses and abbesses sought him for spiritual direction; kings no less than hermits coveted his friendship.

Although, however, he could not but be sensible of his own usefulness and importance, his longing after a more solitary and ascetic life than even his monastery afforded was too strong to be resisted. At the age of thirty-seven he commenced a hermit's life on the little island of Farne, a few miles from the eastern shore of Northumbria, a barren and inclement rock, which in his time had the additional bad quality of being by report the haunt of evil spirits. Why should he have withdrawn thither? His life had hitherto been active and successful. From Melrose, after a short and ineffectual sojourn at Ripon, he had been removed to Lindisfarne, where his life was chiefly spent. All things had gone well with him. He had been enabled to revive and enforce, in full vigour, the monastic rule. He was created Prior, and entrusted by the abbot with the administration and discipline of the monastery. He had encountered much opposition, but his gentleness and firmness had proved too much for the malcontents. In truth, it was of no use to struggle with him; for Bede tells us, he refused to argue, and was contented to assert. Day after day he calmly and quietly repeated his teaching or his orders with unvaried sweetness but invincible determination. A difficult antagonist: he would not dispute; he would not quarrel; but he would be obeyed; and one by one his opponents were subdued. Who indeed could resist a man whose temper was never ruffled, whose heart overflowed with

tenderness to penitents, and whose own life was the best comment on his teaching? Accordingly all opposition had died away; he ruled the monastery with supreme authority, and was as ardently beloved as he was implicitly obeyed. One would have thought, too, that the austerities we have detailed would have been enough to satisfy the most ascetic taste, and to tax to its utmost limits the endurance of the human frame.

Not so thought S. Cuthbert. In his view it was a further advance in 'counsels of perfection' to quit the cenobitic life for the entire and unbroken solitude of an anchorite. For nine long years he lived upon his rock in a rude hut, excavated and erected by himself, seeing no one but the monks from Lindisfarne, who came from time to time, and latterly not seeing even them. He sank his cell so low, and built a wall so high all round it, that nothing could be seen from it but the vault of heaven. He cultivated the unkindly soil, to lighten, as far as possible, the burden of supporting him to the monastery he had left; but his time was chiefly spent in prayer and meditation. Like S. James of old, his knees grew hard and stiff with constant kneeling. Watching and fasting, insufficient clothing, and exposure to the inclement air, from which his miserable hut scarcely protected him, wore down his strength. Yet he never doubted that he was doing God service in the highest way which earth permits; that it was of special grace and favour he was enabled to live this life; that all men should strive after it, and approach, as near as human frailty might allow, to the standard of eremitical perfection. Of course he was not alone in his opinion. Bede's admiration is warm and enthusiastic. Simeon of Durham grows eloquent and poetical while he dwells on the blessings and delights of S. Cuthbert's solitude. Roger de Wendover and William of Malmesbury struggle for language to express their profound and hearty reverence. This feeling is assumed as the groundwork for the whole of the imaginative and in some parts really beautiful and picturesque treatise upon the virtues of S. Cuthbert, written by the monk Reginald, and addressed to St. Ethelred, in the twelfth century. But it is needless to cite authorities or multiply examples. The slightest acquaintance with mediæval history shows us the great reverence which the monastic life inspired, and that even monks were held in lower honour than the hermits. Was this all simply wrong; or was it the exaggerated expression of a true principle, false and mischievous only in its excess?

A difficult question. It leads up into a controversy which has evenly divided the world these many hundred years, on which men have differed really from the first ages, and as to which they will never be agreed until the end of time. With regard

to S. Cuthbert, we might evade it altogether; for though he lived like a hermit, he did not live alone. The wide report of his sanctity brought numbers to his island; he was felt as a living influence from his miserable hovel; confessed to by the penitent, consulted by the great, and in some sense almost as actively employed in his hermitage as when he was toiling over Northumbrian moors to tend the sick and needy, or preaching to ignorant dalesmen amidst the crags of their valleys. S. Cuthbert, however, would not thank us for this apology: nor indeed will candid and thoughtful persons be of opinion that he needs it. No man can fairly argue against a good thing from its abuse, nor deny, because the middle ages exaggerated the honour due to monks and hermits, that there are natures which are benefited by asceticism, and that now-a-days we live too little alone. It may be as real a bigotry which decries celibacy and laughs at solitude, as that was, which forced the one on natures never fitted for it, and thought the other the only safe road to heaven. Men's minds are eternally the same; they have the same general moral and religious wants now which they had twelve hundred years ago; and therefore they demand an analogous supply, and yearn after an analogous expression. If the Church of S. Cuthbert's time needed monks and hermits to its full development, and found in them a natural outlet for certain feelings of mankind, the Church of Archbishop Sumner's time needs some institutions which shall stand in the same relation to the nineteenth century in which monks and hermits did to the seventh. The means must be varied that the same end may be attained. No reflecting person will take a particular doctrine or practice, tear it up from its proper soil where it was in harmony with all about it, and plant it down by itself in another and distant spot, where the earth is foreign to it and the sky alien. The plant will make no root, nor spread forth any branches, and probably will die altogether. Spirit, and not form, is what we should aim at reproducing. We cannot, without doing violence to nature, attempt in one age the forms of another. Rules, institutions, and the like, cannot be called back; it is of their essence that they should be means, not ends; spontaneous, not imitating. The world rolls upon its course, age follows age, and form after form dies off, or, if they do appear again, they move with a ghastly and galvanic action; they have but a spurious vitality; a miserable caricature upon the free and native grace that once belonged to them. If men were to begin to walk about again in gowns and cowls and ropes, call each other brother, pray in a common chapel, and dine in a common hall, they would as little revive the great monastic system, with its glories and defects, as a few outward rubrical observances can regenerate a Church.

But, if we would be fair in judging S. Cuthbert, we must rid ourselves of all merely modern ideas and associations, and view him simply and steadily as expressing, after the fashion of the seventh century, his preference for a life of silence and devotion. We must disregard the form, and look at the substance. It was their way of saying that by them contemplation rather than action had been chosen as their lot. It was, as Simeon of Durham puts it, the choice of Mary, full of joy and sweetness to those who chose it heartily ;¹ nor should we refuse indulgence to the mistakes, if such there were, of men whose ends were so high and so pure. They read the sternest precepts of the Gospel in their most literal sense. They followed the severest lessons which the life of their Divine Master gave them, disregarding overmuch its gentler and more social aspect. They imitated, as best they might, the forty days in the wilderness, and the nights upon the mountains, without remembering the marriage of Cana or the feast of Bethany. And yet in some cases, at least, and especially in S. Cuthbert's, austerities, that appear to us so strange and extravagant, produced no pride, fostered no ill temper, never degenerated into harshness or contempt for others. He depreciates his own merits on becoming a hermit, saying that the discipline of a monastery was far more difficult to endure. The monks invite him to a feast on Christmas-day, and he comes forth and shares their hospitality, delights them with his courtesy, amuses them by his quiet playfulness, and dismisses them with serious and affectionate warning. He is sent for on important business, and he leaves his hermitage to mingle with the world, give sage counsel, and return to fast and pray. Calm good sense, great simplicity, and clear-sighted practical wisdom distinguish him throughout. No one who truly realizes the times in which he lived, however little sympathy his practices may command, would think of calling *him* fanatical.

In truth they were times which needed strong examples, and in which the more common and ordinary effects of Christianity ran a danger of being overlooked. Paganism was still lingering in the island. S. Cuthbert was a contemporary of the sons of S. Edwin, the great monarch, whom Paulinus had converted. Penda, the savage pagan king, was still persecuting Christians, and laying waste the Christian provinces while he was a youth ; many parts of England were first converted even after his death ; and, as we learn from Bede and others, a pestilence, a bad harvest, or a change of sovereign was still enough in the newly

¹ 'Ibi quanto ab strepitu mundanæ sollicitudinis liberior tanto Deo vicinior. O Pater dulcissime, sanctissime reverentissime ! sedebas cum Maria secus pedes Domini ; optimam partem eligens quæ a te non auferetur in æternum.'—*Sim. Dun.* i. vii.

converted portions of the island to occasion the relapse of a whole province from the faith of Christ to the mythology and religious practices of their misbelieving fathers. They were times of fierce conflict, when the war between the good and evil principle partook almost of the nature of a personal struggle; when the dark passions and wild natures of a half-savage people could be held in check only by men as determined as themselves, who should command respect by their own uncompromising lives. Absolute as was the despotism which Hildebrand endeavoured to establish, he was yet a benefactor to mankind in resisting and subduing the empire of brute ignorance and mere physical tyranny which but for him would have overshadowed Europe. And on a less scale and a smaller stage the same battle was being fought in England in S. Cuthbert's time. As the Emperor Henry found his proper antagonist in Gregory VII., so did the sensual profligacy of the half-converted Saxons and the terrible persecutions of the pagan princes require to be encountered by the sight of the endurance and the severities which S. Cuthbert, and such as he, were constantly displaying.

Something also is to be ascribed to the deep and lively hold which the severe realities of religion had upon the minds of such men. They were here to work out their salvation; they had souls which must be saved at all hazards and at any sacrifice. The world oppressed them, and its temptations overcame them; and so they rushed into the desert to be, as they believed, alone with God, flinging away all earthly things, and counting them as dross; that by thus firmly and sternly trampling under foot the world and the flesh they might escape the great enemy, and conquer heaven, as it were, by force. They were very likely enthusiastic, but they were certainly sincere.

We must not in honesty forget, moreover, the arguments which seem to be implied in the words prayer and intercession. By means of these, as the men of contemplation in this age may be, so were the hermits in that or any other directly and practically beneficial to thousands who never heard their names or dreamt of their existence. Ten righteous would have saved the Cities of the Plain, and it is not for us to measure the advantages which all countries in all ages have thus received. Many a great cause has been really won by the prayers of those who are now

* No more remember'd than poor villagers,
Whose ashes sleep among the common flowers
That every meadow wears; whilst other men
With trembling hands have caught a victory,
And on pale foreheads wear triumphant bays.'

Cowper's testimony to the same effect is familiar to every one,

and is surely not only beautiful poetry, but, if we have any faith, what is far better; plain matter of fact and common sense.

This life, whatever we may think of it, S. Cuthbert led, as we have seen, for many years. As we might expect, but little is told us of its details. He lived alone, and left no writings behind him. In general we know that his austerities increased; the fame of his sanctity spread far and wide; the benefit of his advice was constantly desired, and now and then he was drawn forth by persons of rank and station for a short while, and always treated with the utmost deference and respect. At last the time came when the highest honour in the Christian Church was to be forced upon him, and the prophecy which his friend and Prior Boisil had made to him when he was a young monk at Melrose was to be fulfilled to the letter.

Whilst he had been fasting and praying in silent solitude at Farne, the world had been going on in its usual course of conflict and agitation, and the ecclesiastical controversy which had so long distracted the north of England was raging with unusual and unseemly violence. The Roman and the Scottish disciplines had long been contending for the mastery. And though it is impossible to discuss at length a subject at once intricate and obscure, it is yet worth observing that the controversy of the seventh century has a very practical bearing upon that of the nineteenth, and for members of the Church of England is full of instruction and support. Rome, as now, not so much in the person of her Supreme Pontiff as by means of vigorous and active priests and bishops, was endeavouring to compel uniformity throughout the West in discipline no less than doctrine, and striving to subjugate the most distant Christian nations to her own authority. Then also, as now, her authority was resisted, and a whole body of saints in Scotland and Northumbria are found rejecting her claims and vindicating the Christian liberty of their churches. Christianity was planted in Northumbria by Paulinus, the friend and companion of S. Augustine, the converter of the great S. Edwin, the founder of the see and minster of the Northern Metropolis. He no doubt introduced the Roman customs, and if he had continued in Northumbria the controversy probably would never have arisen. But on the defeat and death of S. Edwin, some six years after his conversion, at the hands of the pagan Penda, Paulinus fled with the Queen and her children, and spent the remainder of his life in the south of England, where he became Bishop of Rochester. The infant Church fared but ill for many years. At last S. Oswald, the nephew of S. Edwin, restored order, and revived the failing life of Christianity. He

had been brought up in Scotland, and loved the Scottish clergy and the Scottish usages. S. Aidan came to him from thence, a man of unwearied activity and self-devotion; the purity and beauty of whose character draws forth the hearty and eloquent admiration of S. Bede. All the time of S. Oswald's reign the Church was spreading rapidly and growing steadily, and the Scottish usages were deepening day by day, and becoming part of the religion of the people. The King delighted in the society of Aidan, and in every way, by his own countenance and exertions, seconded his efforts. And when that grave and splendid sovereign fell in battle, he was succeeded in a portion of his kingdom by S. Oswin, who had also been educated in Scotland, and, like Oswald, was the firm friend and patron of S. Aidan. Saxon history can hardly show a more lovely character than Oswin's. So prudent that for many years he kept at bay his powerful and fierce opponent Oswy; so gentle and amiable that men sent to assassinate him dared not execute their purpose, but fell down before him, confessed it, and entreated pardon; so meek and humble that on one occasion S. Aidan is said to have turned from him and wept, saying to his chaplain that he never saw a man so lowly, and that he must needs die soon as his people were not worthy of such a king. He did soon lose his life, and when he and Aidan were removed, the controversy between Rome and Scotland became more bitter, and called loudly for some decision.

The great subject of dissension was the time of keeping Easter, as to which the Scottish and Roman disciplines were regulated according to different modes of computation. There were also other ecclesiastical matters, such as the tonsure and monastic rules, wherein the two parties differed. Aidan had been succeeded first by Finan, and afterwards by Colman, both Scotchmen, and devoted to the Scottish usages. The King Oswy was on their side too; but his son Alfrid, the pupil of S. Wilfrid, espoused the Roman party, and it was at length agreed that a synod should be held at S. Hilda's monastery of Whitby, to decide these disputed questions. The King presided: Colman and Wilfrid argued them, and in conclusion the King decided that he and his people would conform to the Roman usage. A great example of authority claimed and exercised of deciding in things spiritual by a powerful but by no means saintly king, acquiesced in by the greatest ecclesiastics of the time, and never from that day to this supposed to trench upon the privileges of the Universal Church, or to interfere with the rights of that branch of it settled in this island. It is the more remarkable, because from the spirit and temper of S. Wilfrid we may be sure that no right of the Church re-

mained unclaimed, no infringement on her prerogatives would have been allowed to pass unchallenged. His was the presiding genius of the council of Whitby. The struggles of this period are inseparably connected with his history. A man of zealous life, determined character, great ability, but hot and arrogant temper, S. Wilfrid represents the Roman element in the controversies of that age. He was not content with his victory at Whitby. He strove to subjugate the independent Churches of the North to the obedience of the Roman See. Earlier in his history he had driven the monks of Lindisfarne from Ripon, because they would not conform to the Roman usages. The great object of his life was to advance the supremacy of Rome. For many years he met with small success. In spite of his zeal and great ability, his fine architectural taste and personal self-denial, he arrayed against him all the leading persons of the Anglo-Saxon Church. They felt that he might be right about Easter, but he was wrong to force his customs on a reluctant people, and therefore they withstood him. S. Hilda, in whose monastery he was brought up, distrusted and disliked him. The great S. Theodore, brought from Tarsus in Cilicia to fill the throne of Canterbury, a man of large intellect and holy life, took part against him. Finally, he exasperated Ecgfrid, who had succeeded Oswy, by the part he took in the dissensions between himself and his queen Etheldreda. Most men who know the strange story, unless they have prostrated their whole judgment before the mediæval hagiographers, will share in Ecgfrid's indignation, and feel that the imprisonment and exile, which Wilfrid subsequently suffered, were no more than conduct such as his might properly bring down on him.

Ecgfrid was divorced from Etheldreda, who fled and took the veil. He subsequently married Ermenburga; and Wilfrid was deposed and banished. His removal led to several ecclesiastical changes, and especially to a subdivision of his see of York, which was too large for the effective control of a single prelate, and which, according to the favourite policy of Archbishop Theodore, was broken up into three or four bishoprics. It was during the course of these events that a synod held at Twyford in Northumberland, in which both the king and the archbishop were present, elected S. Cuthbert by acclamation to fill one of the vacant sees. In his island hermitage he was not forgotten; and the opponents of Wilfrid well knew the support which the wisdom and sanctity of a man like him would afford them in troubled times and a disputed cause. They elected him in his absence, and forthwith informed him to what a lot he had been called.

He declined the dignity. He loved solitude and contemplation far too well to leave them willingly. In his long and anxious

uttermost the rule he had taught them, and to accept no other. The Roman party of his day did not think lightly of his influence. On his death and that of Ecgfrid their power revived, and their great champion Wilfrid returned to the north of England, and when no longer defended by his venerable name, the Scottish establishments of Lindisfarne and Whitby were subjected to those severe persecutions at the hands of Wilfrid, which are obscurely intimated by Bede, because they obeyed the injunctions of the dying Cuthbert, strenuously refused to yield to the Roman innovations, and kept fast to the customs of their fathers. By placing her seal upon the sanctity of Cuthbert (a fact to be remembered to her credit) Rome has greatly increased, even upon her own theory, the weight of the evidence which he undeniably affords against her encroachments.

The simplicity and dignity of character which Cuthbert had displayed throughout his whole life did not desert him now that he had become a Bishop. He devoted himself to his new work with the same single-mindedness. Constantly moving through his diocese, no district was too wild or secluded to escape his visits. His fame as a preacher drew crowds together wherever he was known to be. His humane and gracious demeanour left a feeling in the hearts of those whom he confirmed, or to whom he administered the Blessed Sacrament, that years did not efface. Day and night he went about among the people preaching, praying, confirming, and celebrating; moved to tears at Holy Communion; with playful and soothing words for those who needed consolation; pale and sickly, worn down with long suffering and fearful rigour of life, his hair prematurely grey, his oval face serene although emaciated, his voice ever soft and low. In time of plague he was amongst the dead and dying, with his prayers and blessings, his countenance bright with unearthly sanctity, his words burning with heavenly faith. In time of need and famine he was there with food for the hungry and clothing for the naked; maintaining the severity of his own asceticism amidst the abundance of his attendants and the luxury of the court; bearing about a macerated body beneath the splendour of his pontificals. A great and glorious bishop—great in his humility, glorious in the reality of his faith and the ardour of his charity. To all men he did his duty, and all men honoured him in return. The poor loved him for his sweet discourses and his tender care. The King honoured him because he protested solemnly against his cruelties, and never shrunk from telling him the truth.

It would indeed have been well for Ecgfrid if he had always abided by the counsel of S. Cuthbert. He warned the King against his northern expedition; he besought him with tears not to venture thither; but he went, and perished. And when

Cuthbert had done all he could for Egfrid's queen and friends, when he had had a last interview with his friend S. Herbert, he felt that his work was done. He and Herbert had been bound together by the closest ties. Every year Herbert had left his island in Derwentwater to be refreshed and comforted by intercourse with Cuthbert. In the year of King Egfrid's death they met for the last time, and Cuthbert disclosed to Herbert that he felt the time of his own departure was at hand. Very beautiful and touching is the passage in Bede's life of him which relates this meeting. It reveals the gentle character of Cuthbert; how capable he was of friendship, what delight he took in it, and with what unbounded, yet reverent affection his friend and disciple regarded him. 'The mighty Cuthbert' loved his friend 'as his own soul;' and, according to the well-known story, prayed God, at the earnest entreaty of Herbert, that, as they had loved and served Him in unity upon earth, so, if it was His good pleasure, they might also die together.

'Nor in vain

So prayed he: as our chronicles report,
Though here the hermit numbered his last day,
Far from S. Cuthbert his beloved friend,
Those holy men both died in the same hour.'

It would be strange if such a man as Cuthbert were really liable to the imputation of hating and despising women. When we come to look into the evidence the charge cannot be sustained. With many of the more distinguished women of his time he was in habits of intimate and friendly intercourse. Hilda, Ebba, Elfeda, and many others, we find continually associated with him. The story told in the 'Antiquities of Durham' of his peril in early youth from a lustful and lying damsel, seems to be nothing but a foolish legend. But in his day the system of double monasteries, collections of both sexes under one roof, and subject to one abbess, was leading in many cases to great abuses. In one establishment, that of Coldinghame, where S. Ebba was abbess, there had been foul profligacy. The monastery was destroyed by fire, which the belief of the country attributed to the visible vengeance of Heaven. When S. Cuthbert heard of it he was full of grief and indignation, and at Lindisfarne forthwith built a separate chapel for the women, that the sexes might not mingle during the offices of the Church. In consequence of this act of his, women were afterwards excluded from all the churches dedicated to and connected with him, or at least entirely separated from the men. This earnest desire to avoid the degrading consequences of a too close intermingling of the sexes occasioned, no doubt,

the unfounded belief of his dislike of women. Nothing, indeed, could be less in character with the mild and tender confessor than such a coarse and indiscriminate proscription. He is absolved by the whole tenor of his episcopate.

Short as this was, it proved too long for his broken health. After two years of unequalled labour and anxiety he found that he was near his end. He wished to meet the great change far from the distractions of the world, to put from him, if he could, all thoughts but those belonging to that other state whither he was so soon to go; for a few brief weeks at least he resolved

‘ to adore
The Deity with undistracted mind,
And meditate on everlasting things
In utter solitude.’

So he left his diocese, bade a last farewell to all those who had so loved and honoured him, and went back to his rude dwelling on the barren sea-girt rock, that he might literally ‘die alone.’ He had not been there many weeks when his pains and infirmities increased, and a mortal sickness fell upon him. The brethren from Lindisfarne did all they could; several of them stayed continually upon the island in a little guest-house to watch and tend their Bishop. Upon one occasion, returning after an absence, we read that they could not land for stress of weather; and for several days he lay in utter solitude, too weak to move, with no one near him, with no food to eat, and a fever preying upon him. His sufferings grew daily greater and his strength less; but no murmur escaped him; his playful spirit consoled and cheered his friends; forgetful of himself, was constantly showing his care and love for them, warms them with holy words and inspiring them with his beautiful example. The fever ran its course; and—as Bede tells the words of the only man who was with him in his cell the hour of evening prayer, ‘when he had received the sacraments, and had strengthened himself for his departure which he knew now to be at hand, by the communion of Lord’s body and blood, lifting up his eyes to heaven spreading out his hands on high, he breathed out his soul upon God’s glories, to be partaker of the everlasting kingdom of heaven.’ At his own desire he was wrapped in a shroud which the Abbess Verca had given him, and which, after some difficulty permitted, carried from his cell to Lindisfarne and interred in his cathedral.

He was scarcely fifty; but he had compressed in a few years more of thought and action than most men. Moreover, his austerities and the weakness of his

him an old man before his time. He was honoured after death as such a man in that age was sure to be; but into the splendour of his shrine, and the romantic history of the wandering of his body, we do not enter. It is enough that the reverence for him was so deeply rooted that twelve centuries and a Reformation in religion have hardly availed to efface its traces. He was the greatest of the northern saints, and equalled only by one or two others in the general esteem of the kingdom. Miracles without number are reported to have been worked at his shrine and by the efficacy of his sanctity.

Some, although not very many, are reported of him by his contemporaries: and it would be unfair to avoid altogether the question what credence, and whether any, is to be given to those accounts of wonders of which the lives of the saints are full to overflowing. Certain points are clear enough. The legends of professed hagiographers may be dismissed at once. They are as little to be believed as any other romances; and indeed it may be questioned whether they ever were intended to be regarded as narratives of fact. Their minuteness, their number, their picturesque character, the strangeness of many of them, the whole air of the relation, seem to us to show that they were written as edifying stories and nothing more. It is therefore a very fearful responsibility which the Roman Church incurs in forcing her members to speak and teach as if they implicitly accepted things of which, in real earnest, they do not believe a single word. Insensibility to the worth of truth is of necessity engendered; and a terrible trial is imposed upon the noblest and holiest natures in her communion. In this we are not speaking *à priori* only; we regard therefore as most mischievous the abject and unreal tone in which so many of the 'Littlemore Series' were written, and the utter want of judgment and discrimination manifested by the author now before us in his otherwise painstaking and valuable history of S. Cuthbert. By the want of common sense, and, as we should say, of manliness in the ordinary treatment of such subjects, many excellent and reasonable men are deterred from entering upon the study of early ecclesiastical biographies, often in themselves very interesting and full of historical importance. Dismissing, however, the legends properly so called from our thoughts, there remains the more serious question as to the truth of the miracles related by such a writer as Bede, for the facts of which the evidence of competent, respectable, contemporary witnesses is adduced.

Scripture indicates with a plainness not to be mistaken that there is some real though mysterious connexion between miracles and faith. Strange as it is, there must be faith in the subject, or

the miracle will not be wrought. 'Thy faith hath saved thee'—'All things are possible to him that believeth'—and many such like texts, are familiar to us all. And further, it appears that want of faith even in the bystanders will prevent the working of a miracle. 'He could do no mighty works because of their unbelief;' 'There shall no sign be given to this generation;' and other such passages, express with sufficient distinctness this very deep and awful principle. Not, of course, that God's arm is really shortened; but that faith is the organ whereby the soul discerns His wonders, and that for an unbelieving soul they are invisible, and practically therefore do not exist. The Syrian host would have scoffed at any one who said he saw 'the horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha.' The Jews saw nothing in the portents at the Crucifixion, and resolutely explained away the fact of the Resurrection. These things happened notwithstanding. There is no logic to bend the will, no argument to subdue an infidel. Faith is the correlative of miracles, and it may well be that in an age such as S. Cuthbert's more miracles were actually wrought than are vouchsafed to later and worldlier times, when the critical intellect is keener and faith less ardent. In the mere fact that a saint has worked them there should be nothing to stagger us. Our blessed Lord is in His saints, their power is His power, their glory His glory; and He who chose to work with clay, or by a pool of water, or by a lump of figs, or by the river Jordan, may surely work as well by the prayer and intercession of a great and holy man. Let the facts be proved like any other facts of history, and there is nothing in their character unreasonable, nothing contrary to common sense, nothing which *à priori* should prevent us from receiving them. Ages of faith are also, it is true, ages of credulity, and evidence therefore of their miracles is to be carefully watched and strictly sifted: but when this has been done, and all caution has been used, their evidence on miracles is to be received as their evidence on any other matter.

Here, however, it is necessary to distinguish the two into which all miracles may be divided. Sometimes the ordinary rules and laws of nature are entirely broken through; swims, a rod brings water from a rock, a river is arrested in its course, a dead man, decaying and corrupt, is raised to life; in these cases it should seem that no one who saw the facts could doubt that they were what we call miraculous. To such cases they are matters of sight rather than faith; evidence of things *not* seen' has therefore in them no scope. But oftentimes the laws of nature remain unbroken, and natural cause and natural effect are visibly connected; or lets his saints and prophets work, through natur

nary operations assume an extraordinary character from their time, their manner, or their occasion. Perhaps it is only that the divinity or supernaturalism which underlies the whole of nature is allowed in these comparatively rare instances to stand disclosed to the eyes of faith. Yet in all reason, and for practical purposes, these are as true miracles as those of the former kind. It argues confusion of thought to talk as if a miracle were disposed of because we can show the operation of a law. The passage of the Red Sea was miraculous although a strong east wind blew back the waters. The Cities of the Plain were miraculously destroyed, although it may be by the fires of a volcano. The walls of Jericho miraculously fell down, although the river may have undermined them and the sound of the trumpets have shaken their tottering foundations. Dathan and Abiram were miraculously swallowed up, although by the agency of an ordinary earthquake. These miracles are as really such, as walking upon the waves of the sea, or ascending up into the clouds of heaven.

It will be at once apparent that with respect to this second class a difference of age will make a great difference as to the aspect under which the same facts, or facts of the same description, may be looked at or spoken of. As tastes differ and opinions change; as one age dislikes what another admired; as men now hold in abhorrence and contempt what their ancestors followed with honour and veneration, so do the religious feelings of a people alter, and what was to one time a miracle is utterly disregarded by another. The facts perhaps remain; the way of looking at them is entirely changed. Bede regarded as miraculous and called a miracle what we neither regard nor call so. Often the facts are undeniable; the evidence for them would satisfy the acutest critic; and it may be that his philosophy, though different, was as sound as our own. S. Cuthbert wanted water in his cell, and he prayed to God, and digging in the sand-rock, he found a little spring. No one who has ever rambled through a sandstone country will have any inclination to dispute the fact. In after years, when the heathen Danes landed in great numbers on the island, Bede tells us that the spring dried up. It would indeed have been marvellous if that which was just sufficient for a single hermit had been able to satisfy a Danish fleet. The Danes stayed but a day or two, and when the monks were able to return, the well was found full as usual. These things Bede tells as instances of Divine interposition; and as no one could see any reason to question the facts, so few men would feel disposed to quarrel with the light in which he viewed them. We should say that there was nothing miraculous in them. But it may, at the same time, be allowed us to hesitate before we

accede to the truth or feel certain of the depth of a philosophy which passes by the multitude of wonders wherewith we are daily and hourly encompassed, and can see in them nothing divine or supernatural; reserving its astonishment for those few cases in which the finger of God is forced upon its attention, or in which the ordinary laws of His dealing are suspended in favour, it may be, of some unknown and still higher, yet equally fixed and settled law.

Bede viewed things differently. Everything that happened to such a man as Cuthbert was in his opinion a divine interposition; and although he sometimes carries his principle into matters which we think undignified, yet there is something very beautiful and very true besides in the practical belief which he displays in the constant and abiding presence of the hand of God. Want of faith has introduced obscurity of thought and indistinctness of expression. It has been too much forgotten that providences which do not interfere with the ordinary laws of nature are miracles to one man and are not so to another; that in a practical matter such as this the more we are disposed to exercise our sight, the more there will really be for us to see. Women in deep melancholy, or in what looks like epilepsy in Bede's account, are soothed and cheered by the presence of S. Cuthbert—as we should say, naturally—as he says, divinely. Is there anything mystical or absurd in thinking that both views may be true together; that nature is there indeed, but that there is also for those who can discern it something more than nature; that one man sees only the garment, that to another is revealed by glimpses that vast and awful form whose veil is Earth and Heaven? Let any man consider what he means when he states his belief that prayers are answered. Is not this miraculous? Try to define a miracle so as to exclude it. No man who ever prayed with all his heart for himself or for another, but has been able to say, without enthusiasm or fanaticism, that his requests have been heard and granted. And yet to the world, perhaps even to the person prayed for, that which is really and truly an answer to prayer has seemed to come, and in a certain sense has come, in natural course.

We may apply the same train of thought to those other miracles related by Bede, in which the ordinary laws of nature appear to have been suspended. These are, almost without exception, cases of disease, in which the prayers of Cuthbert are reported to have worked a cure without the ordinary aid of medicine, and contrary to common expectation. Here, again, the facts are often indisputable; and no one who knows, by experience, the wonderful force of the human imagination, the dominion which mind asserts from time to time over body, will

events which might well happen amongst ourselves at the present day, but in which we should not with them be inclined to discover any marks of special Divine interposition. Another large class of their wonders we should ascribe to the power of the imagination, or the force of the human will; and when these classes are disposed of we should be surprised to find how very little in authentic Church history there is, the facts of which any fair-minded person would feel constrained to disbelieve. The views of this age and the views of twelve centuries ago no doubt materially differ; and we are not called upon, nor do we feel inclined to pronounce authoritatively between them. But it will not be denied that much is gained to the cause of charity and of truth when the difference is shown to be one of opinion and not of fact; and that while we may fairly think such men as Bede mistaken, there is no just ground for believing them dishonest, or for accusing them of falsehood. There is indeed an occasional extravagance, though less often than is commonly supposed, from which good sense compels us to withhold our assent; but in such cases the writer generally displays the manifest insufficiency of the evidence upon which the statement has been made; and it should in candour be remembered, that the temper which led them to discover the wonderful in so many things which they did see, naturally disposed their minds to receive more readily than ourselves the truth of many others, which they did not.

We need hardly remind our readers that, as we have not said, so we do not mean to say that there is any moral superiority in a temper simply credulous or superstitious, which would look upon and believe in a miracle as a marvel only, and accept with the same unreasoning facility with which a child receives a fairy tale, or believes in the existence of the roc or the griffin. No doubt the faith of a cultivated and reflecting intellect is something higher in kind than the superstition of a savage; but the indolent acquiescence in what is told them, which the uninvestigating minds display. We have already distinguished credulity from faith; and we have no desire to pay to the former the weakness that respect and honour which are due only to the latter. We admire in the saints of old those qualities alone which we should admire if we saw them in any generation of the present day; and that practical belief in the presence of God in the affairs of the world which no one would for a moment in terms deny. But many a generation withheld from admitting what appear to be the necessary consequences of such a belief, from a fear of being considered as believing in results which he cannot assent to, and to an acquiescence in a system and teaching which he thinks untrue, and which he believes to lead both to superstition and infidelity.

accept it entire must needs be very superstitious; and it is taught in such intimate connexion with the most important truths of revelation, that its rejection too often leads to their rejection as an almost inevitable consequence. That these dangers do result, not perhaps always, yet often, from the modern Roman teaching on the subject of miracles, we fully believe; and they are dangers which must be neither denied nor undervalued. But they are no legitimate argument against the line of belief which we have been recommending as sound and philosophical. All things may be abused and carried to extremes; but that it may and does degenerate into superstition, is surely no reason why we should not strive after and earnestly cultivate a true religious and enlightened faith.

What we have here advanced applies, of course, only to such writers as Bede, who had the means of being accurate, and the honest intention to be so. It does not apply to the later and legendary writers: and the contrast between the two can hardly be better exemplified than in Bede's '*Life of S. Cuthbert*,' and the work on the same subject by Reginald of Durham, to which we have alluded in the course of this article. Reginald's is a beautiful and interesting book, full of poetry, and occasionally displaying very high imagination; but his object was not accuracy, nor does he exercise any power of critically investigating the authenticity of the tales he tells. It is a prose poem in honour of S. Cuthbert, in which truth and fiction, visions and realities, history and fable, are inextricably blended together. The perpetual miracle, the romantic atmosphere, and the splendid magnificence with which S. Cuthbert is always accompanied, contrast strangely with the bareness and simplicity, the quiet, cautious tone of the narrative of Bede. We feel at once that the two writers had different objects, and that it would be almost as unreasonable to complain seriously that Reginald intended to deceive, as that we look in vain in the *Memoirs of Philip de Comines* for the sustained yet varied brilliancy which charms us in *Quentin Durward*.

Indeed, the lives of saints are but specimens of a law which obtains with regard to all celebrated men. They become heroes: by degrees, deeds and sayings are ascribed to them which they never said or did; their fame acquires strength by time, and gains by perpetual accretion. In the middle ages departed saints were believed constantly to interfere in the affairs of this world. Power was held to reside in their relics, and they appeared on earth from time to time in vision or reality. Some of the most splendid passages of Reginald describe such appearances of S. Cuthbert. In this, and in the gradual increase of the miracles ascribed to him, he has shared the lot of other

saints. It has been remarked of the holiest men, that they shrink from the assertion of that miraculous power in themselves which their friends and historians have agreed to ascribe to them. S. Ambrose, S. Gregory, S. Bernard, for example, are silent as to their own miracles. Francis Xavier, we know, expressly disclaimed the possession of such power. Succeeding ages are less scrupulous. So is it with S. Cuthbert. Doubtfully, and in one instance, he himself narrates a miracle: a careful and painstaking historian sees Divine power at work in a few of his actions; a picturesque legend-writer, four centuries afterwards, presents him to us as an unceasing wonder-worker in life and death.

It will at least be obvious that his sanctity was so great, and the contrast he presents to our own times so complete, as to make him worthy of attentive study. It may widen our experience, kindle emulation, and enlarge charity. It is useful now and then to leave the present time and meditate upon another. It may be profitable to quit for a moment the strife and clamour, the pretence and insincerity which surround us now, for communion with the old devout and simple-minded Bishop who served God, and did what he believed His pleasure all his life long, night and day, winter and summer, in sickness or in health, with an untroubled conscience, a tranquil reason, a purified heart, and an undivided will. The austere realities of his life are a good subject of contemplation for an unreal age, which yet, if it ever thinks, must needs confess that faith like his will alone remain clear and firm when the day breaks and the shadows flee away.

ART. V.—1. *Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique.* Par L'ABBÉ ROHRBACHER. Tom. XXV.—XXVIII. (From 1605—1848.) Paris: Gaume Frères. 1847, &c.

2. *A History of Jansenism.* By S. C. TREGELLES, LL.D. London: Bagster. 1851.

3. *Déclaration des Evêques de Hollande, adressée à toute l'Eglise Catholique.* (Par JEAN VAN SANTEN, Archevêque d'Utrecht.) Paris, 1827.

OUGHT a history of the Church to be a history of Christianity, or not? Ought it to embrace the annals of heretics, as well as those of Catholics? Much may be said on either side the question. On the one hand, it may be urged that, to give it the wider extent, is to falsify the very title; that the squabbles or successes of those who are not of the Church have little to interest or to profit those who are; that the field is in itself so vast, as to render any increase tedious and unadvisable. On the other hand, how, it may be asked, are we to understand the bearing of Church teaching, or the successes and reverses of the true Faith, unless we know somewhat of the machinations and politics of those by whom it is most dangerously opposed? Is it not deep matter of regret that we have so few records of the Arians, because the want of them obscures the annals of those by whom Arianism was put to shame? Again: in the present state of circumstances, no two histories of the Church, if confined to the stricter sense, will mean the same thing. A Roman writer will ignore the East and England; an Eastern historian will give no account of Latinism; a Protestant will well-nigh leap from Nicæa to Luther, or will endeavour to trace the Catholic and Apostolic Church in Turlupins, Bogomili, Goodmen, Albigenses, Wickliffites, and the various Manicheans of the middle ages.

M. Rohrbacher, in the History of the Church which, contained in twenty-eight octavo volumes, he has now completed, has a very clear and defined idea of the work in hand. A thorough Ultramontane, he turns neither to the right side nor to the left, from tracing the fortunes of Rome. Sympathy for the 'Photian Churches' he has none. At Anglican orders he scoffs. A brief sketch, or rather caricature, of events extraneous to his own Church, he gives; but written with such vehemence of party-spirit, such a predetermination to see only one side of the question, such intolerable flippancy towards the earnest-minded men of other communions, as we have never

seen equalled in any partisan history except Burnet. While he has Fleury to guide him, (whose translations from the Fathers in the earlier centuries he confessedly borrows,) he keeps the thread of his story pretty clear. But in his later volumes, it is indeed inextricable confusion. You are referred backwards and forwards, you skip from facts to dissertations, from biography to polemic theology, in a puzzle-headed way of which no description can give an idea. A reader, previously acquainted with the controversies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, may find them in the volumes which we have placed at the head of this article; but, if ignorant of at least the principal historical events of the time, he will in vain turn to M. Rohrbacher's pages for enlightenment.

As a history of the Roman Church, during the period we propose to review, the work is tolerably complete. The Pope-dom, of course, France, and Western Germany, have their full space. The Churches of Japan, of Corea, Cochin China, and, on the other side, South America, are satisfactorily treated. Roman Catholic England and Ireland receive a good deal of notice. But of Spain, Portugal, Poland, [South Italy, and Catholic Prussia, we hear but little. The biographies of the saints and principal writers of the Latin Communion are, however, distinctly and concisely given, and form the most interesting part of each volume.

It may well be imagined that Jansenism and Gallicanism are the two 'heresies' which excite M. Rohrbacher's indignation to the highest pitch. For Jansenism, in particular, he has a choice store of epithets. It is Satanic—infernal—diabolical; the worst heresy ever invented by the devil. Better no God than the God of Jansenius. Jansenism caused the French Revolution. Jansenism gave birth to the blasphemies of Voltaire. Jansenism paved the way for the cruelties of Robespierre. And it is to be noticed, that M. Rohrbacher brands as Jansenists, not only men cut off from the Roman Church, but men who died in her communion:—men like De Neercassel and De Caylus;—nay, men whose only fault was that they taught the doctrine of the Council of Constance and of Gerson. Is it not intolerable that a private ecclesiastic should brand such men with forging the 'devil's masterpiece?'—that an unauthorized writer is to affix the stigma of heresy on every one whose doctrine is not as ultramontane as his own; while, on the other hand, he warns us against condemning the system of Molina, because the Holy See has never condemned it;—*i.e.* because Paul V. was afraid to publish his bull of condemnation?

With respect to politics, the Abbé is a Frenchman of the modern school—that is, of the school that was modern till the

events of this current December, 1851. All power comes from the people. They may depose kings for a breach of the 'original contract.' They, as far as civil power is concerned, are God's vicegerents upon earth; and the French nation is the greatest and most glorious under the sun. During the heat of the Revolution, France was glorious in its martyrs, and equally glorious in its generals; in the one, because they died for the Faith; in the others, because they overthrew the potentates that were leagued in defence of that Faith. But the Frenchman sinks before the Ultramontane. The Abbé absolutely glories in what he terms the annihilation of the old Church of France, and its reconstruction under Pius VII. With an allusion which we had well-nigh called blasphemous, he thus concludes one of his volumes:—

'Enfin, le jour de Pâques, 18 Avril, 1802, a N. D. de Paris, la nouvelle Eglise de France, ressuscitée par la grâce de Dieu, et par l'autorité du S. Siège, célébra sa propre Resurrection avec celle du Sauveur. . . . Et le temps fera voir que la France est vraiment ressuscitée, et cela, nous en avons la confiance, *pour ne plus mourir!*'¹

It is not our intention to detain the reader with any further criticism on a work which will certainly never become popular in England, though we see that Mr. Birwan Browne, a convert to Rome, has commenced a translation of it. Two traits of the author's character, however, we will give. In alluding, as was proper, to Fleury, among the writers of the eighteenth century, he takes the opportunity of doing what a man of taste would have carefully avoided, depreciating in his own pages those of his great rival. In his history of the nineteenth, he does what posterity, we venture to say, will not do: he gives an account of the motives which led to the composition of his own work.

We turn, however, from the work to the period of which it treats, intending to refer, from time to time, as we go along, to M. Rohrbacher and his statements. We propose to confine ourselves, however, to the great struggle between the two principles of Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, which convulsed the Roman Church during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This will oblige us to take into consideration those other disputes, which, doctrinal in themselves, became inextricably interwoven with the question already at issue, embittering and embittered by it, carried on simultaneously, and ended in the same manner.

At the Reformation, Rome found herself, almost at a stroke, shorn of half her territories. By a natural consequence, she doubled the despotism with which she ruled the remaining

¹ Tom. xxvii. p. 655.

moiety. If kings would no longer bend, bishops should crouch to her. If western Christendom would no longer hear Gerson, Latin Europe should obey Bellarmine. The Great Order, with its fourth vow, sprang up as by miracle. Rome everywhere triumphed. France was confirmed, Belgium and Poland re-won, to the Holy See. Well-nigh half that had been lost in Germany was recovered. Austria, so nearly wrested from the Pope, renewed her allegiance. The counter-reformation culminated in Urban VIII. a good-natured man, an elegant scholar, a prince who protected the arts, a prelate, if of easy, at least of decent, life; a divine of sufficient learning to surround himself with the best canonists and deepest theologians; a Pope who, having attained the triple crown at a comparatively early age, consolidated his plans, and carried out his maxims for twenty-one years of an unclouded pontificate. His was the *beau idéal* of papal supremacy. The False Decretals were given up; but the Jesuits did as well without them. If the facts were otherwise, 'so much the worse for the poor facts.' The Latin Church was never more flourishing. Her missionaries evangelized the two Americas; her orders parted Asia between them as conquerors; her martyrs glorified God by hundreds in the Philippines, by tens of thousands in Japan. In Europe, Calvinism was rolled back like a torrent. The greatest saint whom the Church had seen since the age of S. Bernard—S. Vincent de Paul—arose in France. Beza died, adjuring his friends, for the love of Christ, to send for S. Francis de Sales. It was not of course without hopes of winning back to the tiara its brightest jewel that a Cardinal's hat was offered to the greatest of the Caroline Bishops. It seemed as if a second and more glorious empire were preparing for Rome. Her controversialists poured out innumerable volumes in her defence; and the *Bibliotheca* of Rocaberti shows their learning, their zeal, and their onesidedness.

But was all this real? Could a system so false in its origin as Ultramontaniam promise itself stability? That is what we have to see. A tendency to return to the principles of the Council of Basle,—a wish to revert to a more primitive system of discipline,—an echo of the demand made by the Spanish Bishops at Trent,—'Let the Pope give us what is ours, for we give him more than is his,'—manifests itself as early as the time of Paul V. Let us do a late act of justice to a much-injured man:—to one, of whom, whatever were his faults, and whatever his sufferings, we are not afraid to say, *Sit anima nostra cum illo!*

Late in August 1602, there came news to Rome that the See of Spalato was vacant. The Dominicans said some masses for Dominic Marcot, of good memory, late Archbishop; the

the Bishop insisted on all. De Dominis found himself suspended from his functions by the Auditor of the Apostolic Chamber, and this occurred on two different occasions from the same cause. Sequestration from the Pastoral Office gave more time for study, and no doubt the foundations of the *De Republicæ Ecclesiasticæ* were laid in that retirement. 'Here am I,' reasoned De Dominis, 'a Primate, in a country where Pastoral 'superintendence is, if anywhere, essential, suspended on account of a debt which was at first made so in violation of the 'canons,—and is now enforced in spite of facts. And yet we 'talk of the equality of Bishops, and claim to hold discipline 'unchanged from primitive times!' And who shall say that he did not reason aright? Granted that De Dominis was somewhat of an archæologist, had he not provocation enough in a piece of oppression which endangered the souls of his flock, to confirm him in his primitivism? And when shortly afterwards, he issued twenty-two constitutions for his Diocese, and the Sacred Congregation either absolutely, or partially, annulled eighteen, must he not have contrasted his own situation with that of the earlier Bishops, whose names were as his household words?

Soon after, Andreucci and his Metropolitan had another contest, which (whoever was right on the point disputed, the condemnation of some clerks by the former, and their absolution by the latter), brings out the early system of true metropolitan powers as strongly held by the Primate, and brings out, also, a great deal of unseemly violence on the part of both. 'Saul, 'Saul,'¹—thus the Archbishop commences,—

'Why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. Have you not yet lost your military spirit,—though by a leap you passed from the sword to the pastoral staff? Away, my brother, away with earthly conversation,—and now at length casting aside the warfare of this world, enrol yourself after a far different sort in the armies of Christ. Put on the manners, the arms, the spirit that become a soldier, nay, rather, a general and præfect of Christ. If it seem intolerable to you that you are in subjection to me, seek another see; and that not *any* other, but the Supreme and Apostolic, if you would pay obedience to none. Confound not, my brother, I pray you, the order of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.'

All through one sees the character of the man: resolute and, indeed, overbearing in defence of a principle; naturally falling back on early examples, and living more in primitive times than his own; disposed to make no allowance for the altered condition of his own church, and abhorring developement. Having occasion to rebuild the choir of his cathedral, he reintroduced

¹ Farlati, *Illyrie. Saer.* tom. iii. p. 489.

the *synthronus*: and being blamed for raising himself higher than the altar, he met the objection by raising over the latter a most ponderous *ciborium*.

He soon gave another proof of his wish to return to primitive use. The Clergy of Spalato were in a very corrupt state; and a fresh element of difficulty was to be found in the use of the two languages, Latin and Illyrico-Slavonic. A priest only acquainted with the former was perhaps sent into a parish where the latter was employed; or *vice versa*. Now, it needed not De Dominis's reading to be aware that, in early times, no one was admitted into the lists of the clergy without having the voice of the people in favour of his general good character and fitness for the office. But even the Archbishop dared not venture on this; he, therefore, cast about for an expedient that might reconcile primitive strictness and modern laxity. At last he hit on the plan that all candidates for Holy Orders should undergo an examination before the Chapter,—and that on its result a ballot should be taken. This seemed to produce good effects; but, in two years, the Archbishop proceeded much further. He now ordered that all the priests, (we suppose of the city, not of the Diocese) should be 'discussed' by the Chapter on occasion of every ordination, and that such as were thought unworthy of their office should be suspended. This, it need not be said, is as much opposed to primitive as to ultramontane custom. Hence curious records in the Chapter Acts. For example:—

'And so the clerk, Gregory de Benedictis, was first discussed; and he had all the votes, namely fourteen, in his favour, and none against him. Francis Orsillo had, in like manner, all the votes in his favour, and none against him. Innocent Chahich had thirteen votes against him, and one in his favour. The said Innocent was excluded from the Clergy. Francis Manoli had twelve votes in his favour, and two against him, &c.'

It is only wonderful that the excluded Clergy did not appeal to Rome.

In the meantime, De Dominis was wearied out with the usurpations and encroachments of the Apostolic See, and meditated the bold step of leaving his post, and throwing off her jurisdiction. That he did not act hastily, though he might have acted injudiciously, cannot be denied. His three enormous folios *de Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ* were published in 1617: and could hardly have been commenced later than 1607. In the meantime, his sermons, to which multitudes thronged, contained expressions, bolder and bolder, against Roman Supremacy, till at length a hearer exclaimed at the conclusion of one of his assertions on that subject, 'You lie in your throat.' It

was more than whispered that the Archbishop was a heretic; and that steps ought to be taken to procure his deposition. Let us see what was his own state of mind:—

‘From the Episcopate I was raised to the Archiepiscopate. Hence, a new and more urgent occasion of renewing my studies (of the Fathers as contradistinguished from later writers), and of labouring with greater zeal and energy in them. For when the troubles occasioned me by my suffragans, and, much more, the excessive power of the Roman Court, threw every metropolitical right into confusion, I found it necessary to investigate the root and origin of all ecclesiastical degrees, powers, offices, and dignities,—and especially of the Papacy. Then came the interdict of Venice. The books, written on behalf of Rome treated us, Bishops of the Venetian dominions, as rude and unlearned beasts. Hence, to finish my defence, and to come to the truth of the Venetian matter, a fresh occasion of new and more vigorous study. The sacred and ancient Canons, the orthodox Councils, the discipline of the Fathers, the former customs of the Church, all passed in review before me. I found in these, and these only, that for which I was looking, and far more than I had expected to find. . . . It was once an article of faith that the Universal Church, scattered throughout the world, is that Catholic Church of Christ, to which Christ Himself has promised His perpetual presence, and which Paul calls the pillar and ground of the truth; our present Romans have contracted this article, so that by the Catholic Church they understand the Roman Court, and in that, or rather in the Pope alone, the whole Spirit of Christ resides. And whatever has at any time been said in honour of the Catholic Church, they with the utmost force and injury, circumscribe to the Court of Rome.’¹

A man who could thus think, and who was accustomed to speak out, must have found Spalato no safe place. Accordingly, towards the conclusion of 1615, he suddenly went to Venice, probably undetermined what future course to pursue. In what immediately followed, some secret springs of action must have been involved, which it is now impossible to detect. Rome could not have been ignorant of De Dominis’s sentiments. Yet we find him resigning his see to his kinsman, Sforza Ponzoni, and Paul V. confirming the deed: and yet the ex-prelate retained the title of Archbishop of Spalato in all his works. A touching epistle of his to the Spalatense is still extant, in which he maintains his attachment to the Catholic faith,—upbraids them with their cruel misapprehension of his teaching, and earnestly prays them to elect for their new Archbishop some one who should be acquainted with the Illyrian language.

At Venice, De Dominis became acquainted with the English ambassador; and hence Roman writers take occasion to reproach him with having sold his faith and soul for a pension; just as English writers accuse him of returning to Rome because

¹ *De Republica Christ.* tom. i. § 8 of the unpagged Introduction.

his promotion was less than he had expected. Bitter words and cruel insinuations are, however, no proofs. Granted that Spalato was not an opulent See,—still its wealth was greater than anything which De Dominis could reasonably expect in a foreign country. Besides, with his learning and talents, to which such ample justice is done by his adversaries, to what might he not aspire? To any Venetian See,—to the ‘Patriarchate’ of Venice,—to a Cardinalate,—why not to the Papacy itself? And in England, too, with his known sentiments on the necessity of a Prelate speaking the language of his flock,—how could he even wish for a Bishopric? No;—doubtless the ambassador, aware that such a secession would bring great credit to his Church, sounded the Archbishop’s mind, and framed his suggestions accordingly. De Dominis spoke of the Primitive Model. ‘The very thing,’ cries his Excellency, ‘to which we have reformed ourselves. Look—here, in the Canons,—and here, in the Rubrics,—and here, in the Ordinal,—we refer to it expressly.’ The Archbishop spoke of the innovations of Rome. ‘We reject them all,’ cries the Ambassador. ‘No denial ‘of the chalice—no shameless sale of indulgences—no reserves ‘—no Annates—no Bishops by the grace of the Apostolic See ‘—no pallium—no interdicts.’ De Dominis spoke of Sees *in commendam*, Bishops that had ten Cathedrals, and had never seen one; Cardinals that heaped up Canonries, and Deaneries, and Abbacies of distant lands. ‘All those corruptions gone too,’ says his Excellency. Then as to the election of Bishops,—how was that? ‘By the Dean and Chapter,’ replies the Ambassador, ‘after invocation of the Holy Ghost;’—the Recommendation and Præmunire being conveniently dropped. And so, little by little, the mind of De Dominis seems to have been filled with visions of a Primitive National Church, holding the Catholic faith in its fullness, and yet rejecting all the novelties of the Roman Court. Two things more may be observed. The first, that a vernacular service would occasion no difficulty to the Archbishop, himself accustomed to the Illyric Missal and Breviary. The second, that, in close contact with the Eastern Church, a married Clergy would not shock his prejudices. He resolved, then, to fly to England. But this was not so easily done.

On the 23d of August, 1616, he received the agreement of the Pope to the election of Ponzoni, together with a pension of seven hundred ducats. The reason of this unusual favour to a suspected man must remain a mystery. At the beginning of September, he left Venice, giving out that it was his intention to visit the principal cities of Italy. By slow journeys he bent his course to the Grisons; and from Coire, in the middle of

October, he addressed a short letter to the Doge, in which he stated his sentiments on the usurpations of Rome,—explained that he could neither live safely nor rule freely when within the influence of that Court,—professed his unaltered affection to the Republic, and said,—‘This my necessary secession is so far from involving a secession from the holy, pure, uncorrupted, Catholic and Apostolic Faith, that in its behalf I am ready to pour forth, not ink only, but my blood, and my life itself, if need shall require.’

From Coire he proceeded to Heidelberg, (where he published his *suæ professionis consilium*,¹) and thence to London. His arrival made a great sensation. He was presented at Court, received as a guest by Abbot, visited Oxford and Cambridge, and was invited to assist at an episcopal consecration.² His first publication in England was his *Scoglio del naufragio Cristiano*, but the *De Republicâ* must have been put to press at once, because it appeared in the same year. This enormous work, containing upwards of two thousand pages, obtained an immediate European reputation.³ Intricate and perplexed as is the style, unwieldy as is the learning, tedious as is the aggregation of references, it is nevertheless a κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί. It is a kind of quarry whence almost everything that can be urged against Ultramontanism may be extracted. That a work which would make twenty-four fair octavo volumes should be republished, is not to be expected, (though, really, when such a work as Willett’s *Synopsis Papismi* is being brought out by subscription, one knows not what to say,) but still, no English divine is acquainted with all that can be said for his own Church, who has not studied this book. We have an *à fortiori* of two hundred and thirty years since its publication, but that does not diminish its value. It obtained for its author the Mastership of the Savoy, and the Deanery of Windsor.

We think that there is no great difficulty in tracing the workings of De Dominis’s mind, which terminated in his leaving England. This National Church that had reformed itself on the primitive model, in the year after his arrival sent delegates—one of them too a Bishop—to the Synod of Dort. The Acts

¹ This is printed at the beginning of the *De Republicâ*. There is an English Translation, under the title of *A Manifestation of the Motives, &c.* published in London, by John Bill, 1616. It is very spirited, but so excessively free as to lead to the idea that a corrected copy of the Latin must have been used.

² The consecration of Nicolas Felton for Bristol, and George Montaigne for Lincoln, Dec. 14, 1617.

³ The sentiments which Cyril Lucar entertained of it, may be seen in the letters he addressed to De Dominis, as given in Mr. Neale’s ‘History of Alexandria,’ vol. ii. p. 390.

of that Assembly were not precisely those of S. Cyprian or of S. Basil. Abbot, too, shall we say the worst Archbishop that ever filled the Chair of Canterbury? carried matters with a high hand. A majority of the leading theologians were Calvinists, spoke of the successor of S. Peter as Antichrist, and gloried in their isolation from the rest of Christendom. What De Dominis sought,—*Jerusalem, quæ edificatur ut civitas cujus participatio ejus in idipsum*,—was not to be found on earth. He looked back to the Roman obedience—the nurse of his early years. The Spanish ambassador too played a double part. To the Archbishop he enlarged on the heresy of England; to King James he discoursed on the Popery of the exile. Nor were there wanting assurances that Gregory XV. was not in the same sentiments with his predecessor. The fault of a temporary secession would be more than expiated by the glory of a lasting return. ‘Perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him for ever: not now as a servant, but above a servant; a brother beloved.’ The old man¹—he was now sixty-four—yielded, and applied for leave to return to Italy. We can imagine King James saying, or swearing, that he ‘had na sae whaapled wi’ the Paip in his younger days, whilk was weel kent o’ a’ Christendom, as to let ‘the auld fule gang his ways noo.’ However, he appointed a commission—its Prelates were Abbot of Canterbury, Neyle of Durham, Montaigne of London, Andrewes of Winchester, and Williams of Lincoln, Lord Keeper—to return what answer they thought fit. They met at Lambeth, and after hearing the Archbishop’s defence, commanded him to leave the kingdom in twenty days, on pain of coming under the penalties affixed by law to communications with Rome. *It is said*—and the poor Archbishop has now no tongue to deny it—that he earnestly protested his entire approval of the Church of England, and promised never to speak against her. That such a promise was either given or accepted seems doubtful. The price of reconciliation with Rome must be renunciation of Canterbury, and the Roman formula for such a process was not likely to be a very gentle one. Would that we could know what Andrewes thought of all this! Abbot was an ultra-Calvinist; Neyle, a courtier; Montaigne, a bon-vivant; Williams, a man devoured with ambition; and they did as one might expect.

¹ The account given in the ‘*Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes*,’ is a pure fable. ‘Environ six ans après son apostasie, il se sentit tellement pressé par les remords de sa conscience, que pour réparer le scandale de sa désertion, il monta en chaire à Londres, et en présence d’un des plus nombreux auditoires, il rétracta, &c. Le Roi Jacques le priva aussitôt des bénéfices considérables qu’il lui avait donnés, et lui ordonna de sortir de ses états dans trois jours.’—Tom. iii. p. 486.

De Dominis went to Brussels, and there waited for a safe conduct, which never came. During his six months' residence in that city, he is said frequently to have lamented—and naturally enough—his unhappy journey to England. He at length ventured to Rome, and was favourably received by Gregory, who assigned him a pension, and treated him with distinction. Hopeless, apparently, of any reformation; disappointed with that which was on its trial; worn out with years and sorrows; in the power of his enemies; he published a recantation of his works, as abounding in heresies, and injurious to the Roman Pontiff. At least this is the Roman accredited story: and certainly there is a printed book, in which *M.A. de Dominis sui reditus ex Anglia consilium exponit*; and it came *ex typographiâ Rev. Camera Apostolicæ*, MDCXXIII. All we can say is,—that the end of the story does not well agree with the beginning; that De Dominis's style was marvellously improved in the interval between his *De Republicâ* and his *Consilium Reditus*; that the latter book was very necessary for Rome; that the Jesuits had a good many practised pens; and that the Archbishop did not live to disown the work.

Gregory XV. died July 8, 1623. Urban VIII. discontinued the pension of De Dominis. 'Easier that,'—so, or to the same effect spoke the ex-Prelate, 'than to answer my *De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*.' His reward was a cell in the Castle of S. Angelo, and a process in the Inquisition. This was still unfinished when the report went through Rome that the imprisoned Archbishop was dangerously ill. He received the Sacraments of the Church with great devotion, and then went to a higher tribunal than that of the Holy Office, and, we assuredly trust, to a more merciful sentence. Europe believed him poisoned; four of the Pope's physicians declared that he was not. Italian poisoning being so unheard-of a thing, and the testimony of the witnesses so perfectly disinterested, let us give the Jesuits the benefit of the doubt. At all events,

' This surely yet
Might have been granted him,—one sepulchre
Beside the sepulchres of his forefathers.'

But no. The Inquisition finished the cause, declared him a relapsed heretic, and burnt his corpse with great solemnity in the *Campo di Flora*.

Thus Rome destroyed the body; but the spirit lived: and at the very moment was exciting no small commotion in the Church of France.

In 1611, Edmund Richer, a Doctor of Paris, published a

treatise '*De Potestate Ecclesiasticâ et Politicâ.*' In this, he taught that all the powers of the Church are given to the Community of the Faithful; that the Pope is simply their ministerial head; that he is only authorised to act in the intervals which elapse between one Ecumenical Council and another; that he is liable to be called to account for what he has done; that he has a bare Primacy, in short, and nothing more. But he went further: and held that, as the Pope derives his authority from the Universal Church, and is her minister during her pleasure, so each Bishop derives his power from the Church in his Diocese, and is, strictly speaking, its minister; that the Diocesan Synod is that which really governs, and the Bishop is merely a kind of Vicar during the intervals of its session. Thus it will be seen that Richerism, however frequently confounded with Gallicanism, is, in real truth, very different. The systems agree in calling the Pope the ministerial head of the Church; but Richer means, by that expression, the whole body of the faithful; Bossuet and his fellows mean the corporation of Bishops. Again: Gallicanism makes each separate Bishop God's Vicegerent; and Richerism makes him only the Vicar of the united body of the faithful in his Diocese. The latter system, if pushed out to its extreme limits, seems destructive of Sacerdotalism; for how can a body convey supernatural powers, not possessed by itself, to a head elected from itself? Richer, doubtless, had no such creed as this; but his system must be condemned, as tending of necessity to such a developement. Dr. Arnold was nothing but an expanded Richerite. Again: Richer taught, and here, no doubt, he had the great schoolmen of the middle ages on his side, that these principles were as true of civil, as of ecclesiastical, government;—that royal authority is merely a trust from the people; given by them, and by them to be revoked. Gallicanism, on the other hand, was as strong for the Divine Right as the courtier Prelates of James I.

It is easy to guess what the fate of such a book would be. Church and State alike condemned it. The Cardinal Archbishop of Sens, in a Provincial Synod, declared it heretical: the Council of State, Louis XIII. being a minor, proscribed it: Richer was forbidden to defend it on pain of suffering as a traitor: and a retraction of his system was forced from him in the year 1629. But principles that had so much truth were not so easily to be quashed; and now, complicated with doctrinal questions, and finding more or less of false doctrine both in their impugnors and defenders, they were about to convulse the Roman Church.

A few years after the retraction of Richer, two personages, both learned, both zealous, both reformers, were seated in

a student's room in Paris, and discussing the state of the Church. The one—tall, stern, pale, harsh, commanding, looked every inch the ascetic: the other—words, eyes, manner, impregnated with love, the true missionary to a miserable people. The name of the former was Jean du Verger de Hauranne, Abbot of St. Cyran; that of the latter, Vincent de Paul. 'God,' said the former, 'for the sins of the Roman Church is about to remove her: it is useless to oppose His will. He will raise Himself up a more faithful Bride, and will keep her spotless. The Council of Trent, which you uphold, was the packed meeting of a papal faction; to call it œcumenical is an insult to reason: I owe no obedience to its decisions, and will pay none.' And the latter went forth, and warned his congregation against the heresy which he had lately heard.

Who were these two men, and what their past life? Let us begin with the Saint. A Priest, yet directing the holiest Bishops of his time; a *roturier*, yet the companion of nobility; a Saint, yet the favourite of a corrupt Court; a Catholic, yet beloved by heretics; how did he acquire his name, and his influence in the Church? He had been a slave in Morocco, and there his heart was touched with that love which became the guiding principle of his life. Hence that most blessed foundation, the Sisters of Charity. Hence, when the armies of this world swept and reswept over miserable Lorraine,—when fields lay fallow for years,—when wolves boldly entered villages and towns,—when the hearths of cottages and mansions were alike fireless during the winter,—when mice, rats, and adders, were publicly sold, and bought at enormous prices,—when the starvation in the villages was so fearful that men shut their eyes as they passed,—when, to use the words of an eye-witness, the peasants that wandered about were like 'skeletons covered with tanned sheep's leather,'—when high-born ladies sold their honour to the brutal soldiers of Germany or France, that their children might not die before their eyes,—then this true servant of God poured *his* army of missionaries over the devoted country. They, taking their lives in their hands, in perils from pestilence, marauders, wild beasts, went out into the highways and hedges; alms were absolutely rained in upon them from Paris; death thinned their ranks; but Vincent, like a determined general, maintained his post, and poured in fresh soldiers to supply the place of the fallen. They took the infant from the breast of the dead mother,—they set free the Ecclesiastic from drawing the plough like a beast,—they rescued women from perilling their salvation for a piece of bread,—they lived the lives of angels, and 'they died,' says a contemporary, 'as I pray and beseech God that I may die.' The expenses of this

holy war were reckoned at 400,000*l*. The same charity planted missionaries in Harris and Lewis, in Benbecula and the Uist in islands that since the Reformation had never seen a minister of any sect—consoled the Roman Catholics of Ireland under the savage persecution of Cromwell,—entered the dark and fetid holds of the galleys, and turned many a prisoner from darkness to light,—solaced the captives of Algiers and Tunis, ransomed them for their return, or fortified them for the martyrdom;—thence, too, foundlings, rescued from the horrors of the *Rue S. Landri*, became the special charge of the *Ladies' Charity*: thence, when the funds of the new institution were totally inadequate to the work in hand, Vincent called together its supporters, and 'I appeal to you,' said he, 'no longer as the mothers, but as their judges: pronounce, if you will, the sentence of their death: I proceed to take your votes.' Necklaces, bracelets, jewels, rings, caskets then,—broad lands and far houses afterwards, were poured in to the succour of the helpless children; and to that decision, and to that priest, a million infants owe their lives annually in all parts of the world. Such was the great Saint of the seventeenth century.

We now come to him whom Ultramontanians call its great heresiarch—the Abbé de S. Cyran. His fortunes are so interwoven with those of his great ally, Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres, that we must pursue them together. Jansen, born in 1583 near Leerdam, in Holland, was educated first at Utrecht, and then at Louvain, where he formed an acquaintance with Jean de Verger, with whom he visited Paris, and afterwards Bayonne, the native place of his friend. Hence he returned to Louvain, where he was made principal of the College of S. Pulcheria, Professor of Holy Scripture, and finally Bishop of Ypres. This see he only held six months, being carried off by the plague in 1638. Hauranne became Vicar-general of Poitiers, and obtained the Abbey of S. Cyran, by the name of which he is generally known. Here he formed the acquaintance of Robert Arnauld d'Andilly, with whose family he removed to Paris, and became intimate with their connexions. The elder Arnauld was manager of the estates of the Abbey of Port Royal, and by his means Isaac Hauranne was there introduced, and acquired great influence. Agnes and Angelica, in particular, the daughters of Arnauld received his instructions with avidity, and venerated him as a Saint. Accused of false doctrine, he was imprisoned in the Chateau de Vincennes, and after seven years confinement, was released only to die, in 1645.

Such were the annals of two men, the unintentional authors of a schism which well-nigh rent the Roman Church in twain, and which is not yet composed. It mixed two different

subjects, doctrine and discipline, the question of grace, and the question of the supremacy. With the former we intend to have little to do; but some few observations on it are almost necessary. Jansenius had persuaded himself that the accredited doctrine of the Roman Church, on the subject of grace, was Semi-Pelagian. A floating tendency to the teaching of S. Augustine had long characterized the University of Louvain. Baius, a predecessor of Jansenius in his professorial chair, had openly accused the Jesuits of Pelagianism, and was, in his turn, accused of Calvinism. Seventy-six dogmas, extracted from his works, though not ascribed to him by name, were condemned by Pope Pius V., and this condemnation the Professor himself had been compelled to sign.

The Augustinian party were not slow in returning the assault; and it was determined to attack the principle of Molina, a Spanish Jesuit, Professor of Theology at Evora, in Portugal, whose treatise *On the concord of Free-will with Grace and Predestination*, published at Lisbon, in 1588, was supposed to be the most ultra of any. The Dominicans were the principal assailants;—the Franciscans and Jesuits resolved to make the doctrine their own. The affair was brought before the Inquisition. The Universities of Louvain, Douay, and Salamanca, and the great Portuguese theologian, Thomas de Lemos, stood forward in defence of Augustinianism. Baronius in vain besought the Jesuits not to defend Molina. ‘You peril,’ said he, ‘the honour of the Society in the support of propositions scarcely tenable.’ But bolder counsels prevailed. The obnoxious work of Molina had obtained the approbation of the General Aquaviva: and to desert one was to condemn the other. The Society built their hopes, also, on the fourth Canon of the sixth Session of the Council of Trent, and on the condemnation of Baianism. The matter was referred by Clement VIII. to the ever memorable Congregations *de Auxiliis*.

Into the history of those congregations we shall not now enter. They were carried on under Clement VIII. till 1605, the year of that Pope’s death; resumed under Paul V, and finished in 1607. The congregations severally censured the propositions of Molina as Pelagian, Semi-Pelagian, or tending to Pelagianism, and a Bull was actually prepared to condemn them. This is still extant; but the Pope *dared not* to publish it. The Jesuits were too useful to be thrown overboard. The Bull was therefore deferred till the proper time; which proper time has never yet come.

We have already said that we wish to enter on the doctrinal part of the dispute as little as possible; nevertheless, some brief

reference to it is absolutely necessary. We will therefore, as concisely as we can, the present teaching of the Church on the subject of grace; and then that of Molinism, in order that we may the better judge how far the system of Jansenius is opposed to them.

¹ Grace, then, is a supernatural gift of God, whereby man is enabled to merit eternal life, which consists in beholding God. He is. Therefore, as there is an infinite distance between the most perfect creature and God, grace is necessarily not a natural gift to man in the state of fallen nature, but a supernatural gift to man in the state of fallen nature, man in his nature as it was before the Fall; and not a gift to man, but to the most exalted creature. It is the same to angels and in men,—an elevation of both one and the other above their nature. The fallen angels fell from this supernatural state by their own free will: the holy angels remained in it by means of grace, which held them up above their free will in the same manner the first man fell by his free will from this supernatural state; it was as possible, by means of grace, that he should have remained in it. Man unfallen does not need grace less than man fallen; he only needed it for few moments. Man fallen needs it for two great ends,—the one to heal the wounds his nature has received, and then the other to enable him to rise above his nature to God; while this latter is the only purpose for which unfallen man needed it. Grace, being a supernatural gift, it follows that man cannot attain to it by his own power, nor deserve it by his own natural power, but that it depends alike on God for its commencement and continuance. It follows also that if God grants more grace to one man than to another, He does no wrong to any. He in like manner created man originally such as He is, with those sufferings which are the result of sin inherited from his nature, He would still deserve our praise for His work. He does not to inquire why, in granting to all sufficient grace, He grants more efficacious grace to some than to others; this is one of the secret things that belong to the Lord. That which is above nature supposes that nature is below grace. If man, fallen from the supernatural order of things, cannot do no more good, it does not follow that he cannot do good according to the natural order of things. But further, if nature itself has been wounded, he cannot do all the good works that might be done according to the natural order, but some of them only. Again, granting him to do all, he cannot thereby merit grace; he would only invite and dispose God to bestow it; in other words, he would deserve grace of congruity.

¹ We here follow almost implicitly M. Rohrbacher, tom. vii. p. 57.

It is not pretended that this is the pure unalloyed doctrine of S. Augustine. It is S. Augustine modified by S. Thomas. And undoubtedly the Molinists were in the right, when they replied to this observation:—True; but S. Augustine is to be modified by the Church, not the Church by S. Augustine. The present teaching of Rome confessedly and formally contradicts the Bishop of Hippo on more than one point. For example:—it is well known that he constantly misunderstands that passage of S. Paul, *whatsoever is not of faith, is sin*. Instead of interpreting it, That is wrong, which is not done with the full persuasion that it is right, he makes it to signify, Everything, which has not Christian faith as its origin and principle, is sin. Hence it follows that all the good works of heathen, such as giving alms, conjugal fidelity, and the rest, are positive crimes; a proposition which goes far beyond the 13th Article. S. Augustine positively declares them sinful; that Article, with the softeners of a *yea rather*, and an assigned reason, *because they are not done in a particular way*, and as *we doubt not*, can get no further than that *they have in them the nature of sin*. Again, S. Augustine lays down as a principle, that free will has now no longer power except to sin; a proposition expressly condemned by the Church of Rome among those of Baius.

Now, the principal differences between the system of the Thomists and that of the Jansenists may be thus summed up. The Thomists¹ consider the state of pure nature possible: the Jansenists pronounce it impossible. The latter teach that, in order to merit or demerit in the state of fallen nature, the will needs not to be free from necessity, but only from constraint: S. Thomas expressly calls this doctrine heresy,² as destroying the nature of merit. Jansenius teaches with Augustine, as we have seen, that every action of an unbeliever is sin; S. Thomas denies it. The Thomists assert the necessity of sufficient and of efficacious grace both in man's unfallen and fallen state: the Jansenists teach that Adam had simply 'sufficient' grace, and that in submission to his free will; while to fallen nature 'sufficient' grace is useless,³ and the only true grace is efficacious.

¹ M. Rohrbacher examines this question more candidly than is his wont, tom. xxv. p. 443. Both parties have written much on the subject. On the side of the Jansenists, Lalanc, in his *Conformité des Jansenistes avec les Thomistes sur les cinq propositions*, and Petitpied, in his *Examen Théologique*, have perhaps done best. On the other side, Charles de l'Assomption, in his *Thomistarum Tomulus*; and Gouet in his *Apologia Thomistarum*.

² 'Quidam posuerunt quod voluntas hominis ex necessitate movetur ad aliquid eligendum, nec tamen ponebant quod voluntas cogeretur. . . . Hæc autem opinio est hæretica.'

³ Arnauld expressly says:—'Si le diable avait le pouvoir de donner quelque grace aux hommes, il ne leur en donnerait point d'autre que la suffisante.' And so Deligny:—'La grace suffisante des Molinistes est une hérésie, et la grace suffisante des Thomistes est une sottise.'

The former affirm that God has now, as He had before, of Adam, an antecedent and true will to save all men; and by this will He prepares for and offers to each individual sufficient to procure his salvation: the latter hold that, as fall, God's will to save all men is only metaphorical; not to give that *efficacious* grace which alone avails to save, but that *sufficient* grace, which He would have given to Adam if Adam had not sinned. Hence, consequently, the Theists teach that our Lord had a real and true will to die for all men, the Jansenists deny it. The former maintain that man, having grace or concupiscence for his ruling principle, with the general cooperation of the Divine will only, can put out any supernatural grace, to do good works in the order of things: the latter reprobate this proposition in the strongest terms. The former affirm that sufficient grace never refused to a righteous man in temptation: the latter maintain that it may be, even when he does his utmost to resist. Again: 'The least grace,' says S. Thomas, 'can resist the strongest concupiscence:' whereas, according to the system of Jansenius, the same grace which will infallibly have its effect in Caius, when he has two degrees (say) of concupiscence, will infallibly lose its effect in the same Caius, when he has three degrees of concupiscence.

But if the teaching of S. Thomas is opposed to that of Jansenius, it is at least equally so to the system of Molina, who charitably explained¹ resolves itself into the following propositions:—1. God, by the knowledge of simple intelligibles, knows all that is possible, and consequently all the orders of things. 2. By His hypothetical knowledge, He foresees what, in each of these possible orders each creature, using its own liberty, will do, if God gives it such and such a grace. 3. He wills, with an antecedent and true will, that all men, on condition that they are willing to save themselves, that is, to act in correspondence with the graces which He gives them. 4. He gives to all as much help as is necessary, sufficient to their salvation,—though he gives more to some than to others. 5. The grace given to angels and men in the state of innocence is not efficacious in and by itself; in the case of the angels it became efficacious by the good use made of it;—in man it was inefficacious because resisted. 6. So that, in the fallen nature. No absolute decrees, efficacious by themselves, and antecedently to God's prevision of free consent on the

¹ As by M. Rohrbacher, tom. xxvi. p. 492.

of the human will,—therefore no predestination to eternal life before prevision of merits,—no predestination to eternal damnation before prevision of sins. 7. The will of God to save all men, even in the state of fallen nature, is true, sincere, and active; it sent Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of man; and it is by virtue of this will, and of the merits of Jesus Christ, that He gives to all, in a greater or less degree, grace sufficient to salvation. 8. God, by His hypothetical prescience, sees with absolute certainty what man, placed in such and such circumstances, and assisted by such and such grace, will do or will not do; by consequence He foresees who would use grace ill, and who well. When He determines, absolutely and efficaciously, to convert any soul, or to dispose it to perseverance, He forms in Himself the decree to give to that soul the graces to which He foresees that it will consent, and with which it will persevere. 9. By the knowledge of vision, involved in this decree, He sees who they are that will persevere in well doing; who they are that will do ill, or will not persevere in doing well. In consequence of this prevision He predestines the former to eternal glory, and the latter to eternal damnation.

Having made these few remarks on the dogmas at stake, we will proceed with the history

About twelve years after the suspension of the Papal Bull, Jansenius commenced his great work, the *Augustinus*. In this he attempted to develop the system of S. Augustine on grace; and bestowed on this undertaking the patient labour of twenty years. Prevented by death from superintending its publication, he submitted it entirely, in his last will, to the judgment of the Roman Church. The *Augustinus* appeared in 1640, at Louvain; it was reprinted at Paris; and a third edition appeared at Rouen in 1652. The Jesuits instantly attacked it in a series of theses. Both the book and the theses were condemned by Urban VIII, in his Bull *In eminenti*, of March 6, 1642. It was attacked in France by Habert, afterwards Bishop of Vabres, and celebrated for his work on the Greek Pontifical; who was answered by Antoine Arnauld, the now acknowledged leader of the Jansenist party in France.

But it was on the first of July, 1649, that the struggle really began. On that day Nicolas Cornet, syndic of the faculty of theology, laid before the Sorbonne seven propositions, which he affirmed to be extracted from the *Augustinus*. These, afterwards reduced in number, became the five famous propositions, the Lambeth articles of the Roman Church. They here follow:—

1. Some precepts of God are impossible to just men, willing

and endeavouring to keep them, according to the present strength which they have; also the grace, by which they may become possible, is wanting to them.

2. Internal grace, in the state of fallen nature, is never resisted.

3. To merit and demerit, in the state of fallen nature, liberty from necessity is not required in man, but only liberty from constraint.

4. The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of prevenient interior grace for all (good) acts, even for the commencement of faith; and it was in this that they were heretical, that they would have that grace to be such as the human will could either resist or obey.

5. It is Semi-Pelagian to affirm that Christ died, or shed His blood, absolutely, for all men.

The faculty of theology having condemned these propositions, and the Jansenist party having appealed to the parliament, the affair came before the assembly of the clergy in 1650. It is singular that, amidst the number of English ecclesiastics then resident in France or the Low Countries, some of them theologians capable of forming a sound judgment on the question, none should have thought it worth while to express his sentiments on a subject which, one should have thought, possessed singular interest. Ninety-five bishops besought the judgment of the Pope on the five propositions; eleven also addressed him, dissenting from their brethren, and desiring that the question might be examined on the spot where it had arisen.

Innocent X then filled the chair of S. Peter. Of an easy, jovial disposition, he made little pretensions to be a theologian. Leaving those sort of affairs to his secretary, Cardinal Chigi, afterwards Alexander VII., he was sufficiently occupied with the hospitalities of the Papal court, with his alms, which were considerable, and with composing the quarrels of his sister-in-law and niece. If we take a mean point between the epithet of *contemptible* applied to him by Dr. Tregelles, and those of 'active, irreproachable, and extraordinarily zealous,' with which M. Rohrbacher honours him, we shall probably be near the truth.

Five Cardinals and thirteen consulters were named to examine the propositions. Both the Molinists and the Jansenists were heard by their deputies: the most famous among the latter were the Abbé de la Lane, Gorin Saint Amour, and the Abbé Bourzeis. After thirty-six congregations, the consulters were divided, nine for the condemnation, four for the acquittal of the propositions. Of the minority, Luke Wadding, the historian of the Franciscan Order, is the most remarkable; both on

account of his learning, and because his natural tendency must have been in favour of the Jesuits, on account of the alliance between this order and his own. All had been done by the deputies that zeal, talent, and learning could effect. Saint Vincent de Paul, who distinguished himself from the beginning by the most persevering opposition to Jansenism, was in constant communication with the Molinist commissioners, the Doctors Hallier, Joisel, and Lagault, of the Sorbonne; he had used his immense influence in stirring up the Bishops of France to the struggle, and he now exulted in its conclusion. For on the 31st of May, 1653, appeared the famous dogmatic constitution of Innocent X, in which the five propositions were condemned as temerarious, impious, blasphemous, and heretical,—each in its own modification of language. This constitution came on the Jansenists like a thunder-clap;¹ and for a moment the party was completely confounded. Amable de Bourzeis, their own deputy, ceased to defend them; the great and pious Cardinal Thomasius, then a young ecclesiastic, who had maintained that the five propositions were tolerable, now gave in his retraction, and a few of lesser note followed his example. The constitution was at once accepted by thirty bishops then resident in Paris, by the Sorbonne a fortnight after, and even, where opposition had chiefly been expected, in Brabant.

Antoine Arnauld and his friends, together with the greater part of the Dutch ecclesiastics, then under the Archbishop of Philippi and Utrecht, Jacques de la Torre, soon traced out the plan for their future operations. They acquiesced in the condemnation of the Five Propositions,—that is to say, in the sense in which they were condemned by the Pope,—but they affirmed that these propositions, neither in sense nor in words, were contained in the Augustinus, nor held by Jansenius, and that Jansenism was a mere Jesuit phantom. Hence the Molinists accuse them of the grossest duplicity. ‘You fought,’ say they, ‘for the Five Propositions before they were condemned,—after their condemnation you are willing to anathematize them;—

¹ At the end of Leydekker's *Historia Jansenismi*, there is an account of a colloquy held between the famous Swiss Calvinist, Hottinger, and the Jansenist Commissioners, on their return to Paris. The conclusion to which this fiery Protestant comes is as follows. It is in the last page of the book:—‘Ego hinc elicio 1. Papam, parti utique gratificaturum, pro more orbem Christianum lussisse. Publice damnavit Jansenistas; privatim Augustini doctrinam probavit. Hac calliditate Pontifex usus fuit in controversiis inter Franciscanos et Dominicanos et aliis prope omnibus. 2. Jansenistas mediam ex Augustino inter Reformatos et Molinistas querere viam, quæ non datur. 3. Captiose et calumniose Reformatorum doctrinam ab iis proponi. 4. Multum tamen eos lucis habere.’

'before the 31st of May, 1653, you defended them because they were of Jansenius,—since that time you attack them because they are not of Jansenius.' But surely the answer to this is sufficiently easy. 'We defended the propositions,' the party replied, 'because we considered them capable of a good sense; we condemn them when taken in a bad sense; we did not deny that, considered in the former light, they expressed to a certain degree, the teaching of Jansenius; considered in the latter, we deny that, words or sentiments, they are his.' *A Tu quoque* argument is always a miserable resource: but the Jesuits have amply laid themselves open to it,—and it is not ill-stated by Dr. Tregelles. 'Casuistry of the most scandalously immoral kind was pointed out in the writings of the Jesuit Bauny. The Jesuits boldly averred that the opinions were detestable; that they "marked an abandoned conscience:" an holder of such ideas must be an agent of the demon. They denied, however, that the book of Bauny contained the cited passage, and thus they raised a loud outcry of fraud and imposture. They, however, were the fraudulent impostors themselves; the passage was Bauny's. At length, when all knew that the opinion had been held by a Jesuit, they turned round and affirmed it to be innocent.'

The controversy, however, now raged on the question, whether the Five Propositions were or were not to be found in the Augustinus. At a somewhat later period it was that Louis XIV. desired the Count de Grammont to read the book, and to tell him whether they really existed there. One may easily imagine the style in which the unfortunate nobleman performed the enjoined task. 'I have read the book, if it please your Majesty,' said he, after some weeks had elapsed. 'And the propositions?' 'I have not been so fortunate as to find them, but they may be there, for all that, incognito.' The French Bishops assembled at Paris, to the number of thirty-nine, for the purpose of discussing this question. A committee of eight was appointed, to investigate the matter. Ten sessions were employed in comparing the book itself with the propositions; and it was at length voted that the Constitution had condemned them as being of Jansenius, and in the sense of Jansenius; and that the Pope should be informed of this resolution. The result of such a communication was a brief, addressed by Innocent X. to the general assembly of the clergy of France, in which he declared that he condemned the propositions as being of Jansenius, and in the sense of Jansenius.

Here the See of Rome evidently committed a fatal error. The Universal Church, even assembled in an Œcumenical

Council, though infallible on matters of doctrine, may err, and has erred, on matters of fact. The seventh Council is a remarkable example. Here the great cause of Christian Art was victoriously asserted: although the proofs on which the decree of the Synod was based have been shown by a more enlightened criticism to be for the most part erroneous. That S. Athanasius said this, or S. Basil said that, the Council might assert, and might assert mistakenly:—but the doctrine delivered on that mistaken assertion nevertheless was infallible. If then the Church itself could be deceived in a question of fact, how much more, said the Jansenists, the Pope!

This it was endeavoured to meet by a distinction between a fact and a *dogmatic fact*: a distinction embraced by the assembly of the French clergy, in 1656. A fact is one which has no connexion whatever with doctrine: a dogmatic fact one which is in some way or other connected with some question of dogma. The difficulty naturally occurs, what question of fact is ever likely to come before the Church, which is not so connected? The defence of the brief is now usually conducted on a somewhat different principle. A very good example of the reasoning usually employed is given by the negotiations which took place somewhat more than twenty years ago between Cardinal Cappucini, Papal Legate in Holland, and M. Van Santen, the present Archbishop of Utrecht. The conversation which passed between them on the subject of the Formulary, based on this brief, is reported by Dr. Tregelles as follows, (and we have reason to know that his report is substantially correct.)

'Van Santen.—I have read the *Augustinus* of Jansenius more than once through: I *know* that the Five Propositions, as condemned, are not contained in that book:—how can I then, as an honest man and a Christian, subscribe a statement as true which denies a simple fact? I have to do with God and my conscience, even if the Pope and the whole Church should be misinformed. As they cannot alter a fact, so they have no authority from God to require me to sign my name to a declaration which contradicts a fact.

'Cappucini.—You see, M. Van Santen, that the table at which we are sitting is covered with a *green* cloth. Now, supposing that the father of a family were to prohibit his children absolutely from entering this room, or even looking into it. Well, but if one of the children were to look in through the keyhole, and were thus by disobedience to acquire the knowledge that the cloth on the table was *green*, how would the case then stand? If the father were to make out an inventory of the room, and if he were (whether by mistake or design it matters not) to describe the cloth as *red*, and if he were, on the ground of his parental authority, to require each of his children, as relying on their father's information, to describe this inventory as perfectly correct; it would not be competent for the child who had seen the cloth to act upon the knowledge he had gained by his disobedience. The father had a right to forbid his children to look into the room; he had

also a right to prescribe to his children what they should sign; and no act of prior disobedience on the part of any of them could take away the obligation of unhesitating compliance.

Archbishop Van Santen.—You have brought forward a curious illustration, but how would you apply it? and how would you vindicate, even in such a case, the subscription to a known untruth?

Cappucini.—There is no untruth at all supposed in the case that I have put. The child is absolutely bound to believe his parent; and as the only ground he could have for any scruple of conscience would be part of his sinful disobedience, he ought to say, The command of God requires me to believe my father; I must, therefore, obey him in this point, even at the sacrifice of my own opinion. And as I am bound, in duty to God, to declare my belief that the cloth is *red*, I may reasonably suppose that my eyes were mistaken when I saw it. Perhaps a sunbeam hindered me from seeing the colour correctly, or perhaps in punishment to my disobedience an optical illusion was sent to deceive me. Any of these considerations is enough to justify me fully in subscribing my full belief that the object is really red, and not green.

Archbishop Van Santen.—But how do you apply the idea of *knowledge obtained through disobedience* to the question of fact involved in subscription to the formulary?

Cappucini.—... Obedience would require that the work of Jansenius should not be read, since it was condemned by the bull of Urban VIII. "*In eminenti.*" Any knowledge, therefore, which any person now has of the contents of that book, must have been obtained through transgression of that obedience to which he was bound.

But we must return to Arnould. In the November of 1655, he was charged with having, in his second *letter to a Duke and a Peer*, maintained doctrine condemned by the Holy See. The points were reduced to two heads;—the one, the assertion that the Five Propositions had never been held by any one; that to attribute them to Jansenius was to attribute heresy, which he abhorred, to a Catholic Bishop; and that the Propositions were neither literally, nor virtually, contained in the *Augustinus*. The other, this sentence:—That 'the grace, without which we can do nothing, was wanting to a righteous man in the person of S. Peter, on an occasion in which it is impossible to say that he did not sin.' The sentence condemned the first of these propositions as rash, scandalous, and injurious to the Pope and to the Bishops of France: and the second as rash, impious, blasphemous, worthy of anathema, and heretical. The majority was one hundred and thirty doctors to eight; and Arnould, refusing to sign this sentence, was ejected from the Sorbonne.

The next step was to destroy Port Royal, the focus of those sentiments, which had been implanted in it by S. Cyran, and fostered by the Arnoulds. We shall dwell at no great length on the history of this transaction, because the subject has already been related at full. An order in Council was obtained that every postulant and novice should be removed

from the convent. But these proceedings were unexpectedly stopped. One evening in March, 1656, Paris was startled by the announcement that a miracle, as astonishing as indisputable, had been wrought in the Port Royal. The subject, Mademoiselle Marguerite Perrier, a child of ten years old, the niece of Blaise Pascal, whose earlier Provincial Letters were then in every one's hands and mouth: the disease, an inveterate ulcer in the left eye; the means of cure, a thorn from our Lord's Crown. The effect was absolutely electric. The Molinists were thunderstruck. Cardinal Mazarin caused the miracle to be officially published. Public opinion, already owning the force of Pascal's letters, veered rapidly round. We, at a distance, and viewing the subject without prejudice, may form a calmer judgment: much may be said for and against the reality of this miracle: but the positive evidence seems to preponderate slightly. The facts of the disease and of the sudden cure are not denied. But it is urged: 1. That the very opportune time in which the miracle was wrought, is in itself suspicious. To which it is replied, What other period, *à priori*, so likely for a supernatural interference? And by the same rule the invention of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, and the cure of the blind man, must be set down to a pious fraud on the part of S. Ambrose. The second objection is more formidable:—that Flavie Passart, to whose sole charge the young lady had been entrusted, afterwards became a setter-up of false miracles. She, it is said, might have caused the disease, and might have cured it by natural means. At the time, however, no traces of collusion were discovered; and it may not be improbable that the fact of having seen one true miracle, suggested to the unfortunate nun the possibility of counterfeiting them. Mademoiselle Perrier herself, who lived for nearly eighty years afterwards, was always convinced of the reality of the miracle.

Alexander VII., the same Cardinal Chigi who had been so instrumental in procuring the Constitution of Innocent X., now filled the Roman chair. He renewed, by a Brief of Oct. 16, 1656, the condemnation of the Five Propositions, and the explanation that they were condemned as being of Jansenius, and in the sense of Jansenius. The Church of France at once received the Brief.

This Brief gave rise to the celebrated Formulary. In the general assembly of the French clergy of 1657, it was determined that the following formula should be signed by all candidates for ecclesiastical preferments:—‘I submit sincerely to the Constitution of Pope Innocent X. of the 31st of May, 1653, according to its true sense, which has been determined

‘by the Constitution of our venerable father, Alexander VI of the 16th of October, 1656. I acknowledge that I am obliged in conscience to obey these Constitutions; and I condemn with my heart and mouth the doctrine of the Five Propositions of Cornelius Jansenius, contained in his book entitled *Augustinus*, which these two Popes and the Bishops have condemned; which doctrine is not that of S. Augustine, whom Jansenius has explained ill, against the sense of this holy doctor.’ The miracle, however, and the Provincial Letter caused the definite promulgation of this formula to be deferred till 1661. But matters were carried on with a high hand:—on the night of the 10th of December, 1656, the monument of Jansenius, in the Cathedral of Ypres, was broken down by the Bishop, in defiance of the remonstrances of the Chapter, and the opposition of the citizens.

And here it is that the teaching of Gerson, of the Council of Basle, of De Dominis, takes a definite connexion with that of Arnould and Nicole. The two were conjoined by the great S. Cyran,—were to be held more definitely by the great doctor, Ellies Dupin, and to a certain extent, by Tillemont. And the natural explanation of such a connexion is this. He was the Pope asserting for himself not only that doctrine of infallibility which the Church does claim, but that historical infallibility which she does not claim. Here were articles of faith laid down, without reference to a Council, and articles of fact which no Council would have dared to promulgate. The natural question arose, as we have seen,—What right has the Pope to claim infallibility in a point of fact? And then came another question close behind,—What right has the Pope to claim infallibility, without appeal, on a point of doctrine?

The great work of S. Cyran, the *Petrus Aurelius*, had been strongly opposed to the ultramontane teaching of the Roman court. It had been ordered, in the general assembly of the clergy of France, of 1646, that these volumes should be magnificently reprinted in folio,—that two copies should be presented to each Bishop of France, and the rest distributed among the learned. This compliment is, of course, extremely hateful to the Molinists,—and they point with satisfaction to the fact that at a later period, the eulogy passed on S. Cyran in the *Gallia Christiana*, was erased by order of the assembly of the clergy. Their criticisms on the work are not very flattering. ‘*Le Petrus Aurelius*,’ says one of the most furious of Molinist authors, the compiler of the *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes*,—‘est rempli des erreurs les plus monstrueuses. En un mot, S. Cyran était réformateur hypocrite, un hérésiarque juridiquement atteint, et co-

' vaincu d'être Manichéen, Luthérien, Calviniste : d'avoir plus parlé en faveur de Genève que de l'Eglise, et plus en conformité du Synode de Dordrecht que du S. Concile de Trent.' But writers whose opinion is of somewhat more weight, have characterized the work differently. Thomassin observes that, with respect to the power and authority of Bishops, no one has written more learnedly than Petrus Aurelius. The great Portuguese theologian, Pereira, speaks of these treatises in terms of the very highest praise. And no doubt they exercised great influence over the teaching and the practice of the Gallican Church.

In like manner, Martin de Barcos, the favourite nephew of S. Cyran, had promulgated, as far back as 1645, what M. Rohrbacher and other ultramontanes call *the heresy of the two heads that only make one*.¹ i. e. the doctrine that from SS. Peter and Paul conjointly is derived the authority of the Pope as visible head of the Church. This teaching it pleased Innocent X. to stigmatise, in 1647, as heresy.

But tenets like these were not as yet received by the French Clergy; and with the authoritative promulgation of the Formulary, the persecution of the Jansenists commenced in earnest. Arnould, Bishop of Angers, was the leader of the few Prelates who refused to accept it. But the Bastille was crowded with inferior Jansenists; seventy-five nuns and postulants were carried, almost by force, from Port Royal; the Mère Angélique, after years of trial, breathed her last on the 6th of August, 1661, and her sister, the Mère Agnes, had to bear the brunt of the storm. Flavie Passart, the perfidious guardian of Mad. Perrier, proposed that the house of Port Royal de Paris should be taken from its possessors; and the few nuns who accepted the Formulary, were accordingly put in possession of it. Mère Agnes, with the larger portion, were confined to Port Royal des Champs.

The 22d of May, 1667, saw Alexander VII. on his death-bed. After having received extreme unction, he signed with a trembling hand the brief which condemned the four protesting bishops. His successor was Cardinal Rospigliosi, who took the name of Clement IX. It was understood that he was no friend to Molinist views; and the Duchess of Longueville, the cousin of Louis XIV., a warm protector of the Jansenists, interested that monarch in their sufferings, and by his means brought about the celebrated pacification of Clement IX. By

¹ The title, which has no name of author or place, is *De l'Autorité de S. Pierre et de S. Paul ; qui réside dans le Pape, successeur de ces deux Apôtres.*

this,—the original Formulary being entirely dropped,—it was only required to anathematise the Five Propositions, with a reservation of the sense of S. Augustine. This pacification M. Rohrbacher, with a onesidedness which is perhaps worse than any downright falsehood, dismisses in two contemptuous lines:—‘*Cet excellent Pontife amena les Jansénistes à se soumettre, au moins extérieurement, aux décisions du Saint-Siège touchant leurs erreurs.*’ Whereas, it is very clear, the pacification bore out the Jansenists in all that they had done, with the exception of their first defence of the tolerable sense of the Five Propositions, and that had long been freely abandoned.

The condemnation of the sixty-five Jesuit propositions by Innocent XI. which M. Rohrbacher, with his usual fairness, forgets to mention,—was the last triumph, and the precursor of the downfall of the first series of French Jansenists. Arnould and Nicole, the illustrious author of the *Perpétuité de la Foi*, gave too much assistance in dragging forth to light the abominable casuists of that Society, of which it may truly be said as of Origen:—‘*Ubi bene, nemo melius: ubi male, nemo pejus.*’—and this could not be forgotten. Shortly after the death of the Duchess of Longueville, the nuns of Port Royal were forbidden to receive novices. But other influences were at work, which raised up a more tremendous opposition to Rome than it had experienced since the days of the Reformation.

For then came the celebrated Assembly of 1682, and the Gallican Articles. M. Rohrbacher puzzles himself to account for the fact that Bossuet was more lenient to the Jansenists than was Fenelon—though the semi-quietism of the latter might have been a reason why he should rather have acquiesced in the teaching of Arnould and Quesnel. Surely the reason is manifest. The Eagle of Meaux must have felt that his own views were the same on discipline with those of the Jansenists,—however widely they might differ as to doctrine. Fenelon, on the other hand, with his ultramontane tenets, had besides them the same reason for hatred to the doctrines of the Jansenists as the latter to those of the Calvinists:—that he regarded them as a caricature of his own.

While the nuns of Port Royal were dying off, and persecution was wearing out, but not disheartening, the little band of survivors, Rome was engaged in a new controversy on Jansenism. Pasquier Quesnel, born in Paris in 1634, imbibed in the Congregation of the Oratory the sentiments of Jansenius, for which it was then distinguished. Named, at the age of twenty-eight, director of its institution at Paris, he composed for the use of the youth under his charge his *Pensées Chrétiennes sur le Texte des Quatre Evangélistes*. This was adopted by the

then Bishop of Châlons-sur-Maine, Felix Vialart, as a text-book for his Diocese; and Quesnel employed himself in elaborating what he had already written, and in extending his labours to the rest of the New Testament. Before long, however, he was desired by De Harlay, then Archbishop, to leave Paris; and he took up his residence at Orleans. Here, in 1684, his signature was demanded to a formulary which the General Assembly of the Oratory imposed on all its members. The philosophical part of this document contained some principles of Cartesianism. Quesnel refused its signature, joined Arnauld at Brussels, continued with him till his death,—and was then regarded as the chief of the party.

Whether Jansenius held the Five Propositions, or not, it is scarcely possible to deny that Quesnel did, and that in the strongest form. They occur in almost every page of his *Réflexions Morales*, which, appearing in 1694, now embraced the whole of the New Testament. De Noailles, then Bishop of Châlons, finding that the former edition of the work was popular in his Diocese, approved this also; and was shortly afterwards transferred to the Archbishopric of Paris. Here he condemned, in the course of the next year, a work of Barcos, the nephew of S. Cyran, whom we have already noticed, which had for its title, *Exposition de la Foi de l'Eglise, touchant la Grâce et la Prédestination*, as containing doctrine, 'false, temerarious, scandalous, impious, blasphemous, injurious to God, worthy of anathema and heretical; also as renewing the doctrine of the Five Propositions of Jansenius, with a temerity the more intolerable, that the Author dares to set forth as being of the Faith, that which is not only not so, but which the Faith abhors, and which is detested by all the Church.' The Cardinal, however,—whose character was completely that of a certain influential Bishop of our own times—had better have left this performance alone. In a few weeks appeared the famous *Ecclesiastical Problem: whether one ought to believe M. Louis Antoine Noailles, Bishop of Châlons in 1695, or M. Louis Antoine Noailles, Archbishop of Paris in 1696*. A parallel is drawn between the *Réflexions* which the Bishop approved, and the *Exposition* which the Archbishop condemned; and the absolute identity of their doctrine is set forth. We have never been able to see this work, which is of some rarity; but we have been told that its author, Dom. Thierry de Viaixnes, a Benedictine, and a great writer for the party, having the Archbishop fairly down, kick and tramples on him unmercifully,—and that the satire is as cutting as that of the *Lettres Provinciales*. Poor De Noailles obtained an *Arrêt* from the Parliament of Paris, which condemned the *Problem* to the fire. This was easy enough; but

the Cardinal's character, both as an honest man and a theologian, was seriously damaged. A new edition of the *Réflexions* appeared in 1699, but without the approbation of the Archbishop.

The Molinists compelled their instrument, Clement XI., to move actively. In 1700, forty doctors of the Sorbonne declared that a *respectful silence*, without submission, was all that was due to a dogmatic decree of the See of Rome. Forth came the *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*, July 15, 1705, condemning this decision in the strongest terms; renewing all the doctrines of the Constitution and the Formulary, and making no account whatever of the Pacification of Clement IX. The General Assembly of the French Clergy received this Constitution; the Bishop of Saint Pons alone had courage to publish a *Mandement* against it. The term *respectful silence* is here traced to its authors, (the twenty-three French Bishops who had similarly employed it in 1663,) and is justified. Thus encouraged, Clement XI. on the 13th of July, 1708, condemned the *Réflexions Morales* as enunciating the Jansenian heresy. At the same time the destruction of Port Royal was carried into execution. Dr. Tregelles shall relate the facts,—though we will omit a few of his reflections:—

‘On the 26th of March, 1708, Pope Clement XI. issued a bull for the entire suppression of Port Royal des Champs. On the following 11th of July, Cardinal de Noailles was forced to issue his orders for the suppression of the Abbey. On the 29th of October the valley was filled with troops;—a commissary entered the Abbey, who demanded all the title deeds that they might have there; he then further declared his commission to disperse all the nuns immediately. The Prioress gave them her blessing for the last time; and they were sent separately into confinement in different nunneries, as obstinate heretics. Their removal was accompanied by circumstances of great cruelty.’ (Louise de Sainte Anastasie du Mesnill de Courtiaux, governed the House as Prioress; no fresh election of an Abbess having been allowed.) ‘Thus they passed years of suffering. The Prioress was confined at Blois, where she died after six years of captivity. In her last illness she was allowed no rest on the subject of the Formulary. The Bishop of Blois troubled her incessantly; she must either sign or else die without the Sacraments. The Bishop asked her—“What will you do when you have to appear before God, bearing the weight of your sins alone?” The dying Prioress replied,—“Having made peace through the Blood of His Cross, my Saviour hath reconciled all things to Himself in the body of His flesh through death, if we continue in the faith grounded and settled.” She then added, with clasped hands—“In Thee, O Lord, have I trusted, nor wilt Thou suffer the creature that trusts in Thee to be confounded.” The Bishop reviled the dying saint, who meekly besought, with many tears, that she might be permitted to receive the Sacrament. He absolutely rejected her request, as coming from a condemned heretic. “Well, my Lord,” she said, wiping her eyes, “I am content to bear with resignation whatever deprivations my God sees fit; I am convinced that His divine grace can supply even the want of Sacraments.” She fell asleep in the Lord the same night, March 18, 1716, in her seventieth year. The nuns were dispersed in 1709; in the following year the buildings were pulled

down. In 1711, the bodies were disinterred from the burial-ground, with the grossest brutalities and indecency; and in 1713, the church itself was demolished. Thus fell Port Royal.¹

The disinterment of the bodies in the burial ground of Port Royal, the cemetery of the nuns for five hundred years, is undoubtedly the most disgraceful act which the Molinists ever perpetrated. Nor, when we read of the horrible outrages perpetrated on the corpses of women, must we forget that they were carried on by command of a woman—one, too, professing piety—Madame de Maintenon. The penitence of De Noailles, his bitter self-reproach, his vacillation to the end of his life, and final Molinism—these things are a wonderful lesson to those who love the praise of men more than the praise of God.

But to return. In February, 1712, Clement XI. appointed a congregation of five Cardinals and eleven Theologians, to consider the *Réflexions Morales*. After the deliberations of a year-and-a-half—the assemblies having been for the latter part of the time held twice a week, and the Pope generally being present—the work was ended. On September 8, 1713, appeared the famous Constitution, *Unigenitus*, in which 101 propositions, extracted from the writings of Quesnel, were condemned, not separately, (as is usually the case,) but in the lump. This dogmatic Constitution, perhaps the severest blow the Roman Church ever received, may be regarded as the work of three persons—Louis XIV., Madame de Maintenon, and Le Tellier, the King's confessor. M. Rohrbacher's abstract of this Constitution is as follows:—

'1. It teaches that no commandment of God is impossible, and it condemns those who maintain that the commandments of God are impossible, when not obeyed. This is the sense of the five first propositions of Quesnel.

'2. It teaches that we may resist grace, and condemns those who maintain that we can never resist it.—(Prop. 6—39.) It teaches, according to the words of Jesus Christ, that He came to seek and to save that which is lost, and condemns those who restrain the benefit of redemption to the elect alone.—(Prop. 30—33.) It defines that grace is necessary and gratuitous, and condemns those who, in attacking this doctrine, renew the Pelagian heresy as regards unfallen nature, in Prop. 34—37. It teaches that free will exists in fallen nature, and condemns those that deny it.—(Prop. 38—43.)

'3. It teaches that there are good actions which do not spring from a motive of love, and condemns those who maintain the contrary; because all that God commands is good, but He commands other acts besides love. These acts, then, are good. On this principle, it condemns the Propositions 44—67, which suppose that God can command acts which are not good, but evil; which is to agree with hell in its most horrible blasphemies.

'4. It teaches, after Jesus Christ, that, if we would enter into life, we must keep the commandments; that thus there are other means of salvation than faith and prayer; and it condemns those who reduce all means of

¹ "The Jansenists," p. 40.

safety to these two, as Prop. 68 does, which thus provokes fanaticism and illusion.

'5. It teaches that first grace is gratuitous; that, if we merited it, it would not be grace; that glory is, nevertheless, a *crown of righteousness* as due to merits, and condemns the error which teaches that first grace and glory are equally gratuitous, as Prop. 69, which supposes that man, not being free, merits no more than an automaton.

'6. It teaches, after the Scriptures and tradition, that God sometimes afflicts us to prove us, and condemns the error which teaches that God never afflicts except for the sake of punishing or purifying the sinner: (Prop. 70,) whence it might impiously be concluded that if the Blessed Virgin, the Patriarch Job, and so many martyrs have suffered more than others, it was because they were greater sinners than others.

'7. Following this saying of Jesus Christ, "If any man destroys one of the least of these commandments, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven," the Constitution teaches that man cannot dispense with the observation of the commandments of God, and rejects the error which asserts that every one, for his preservation, may dispense with their observation. This is the error of Prop. 71, which opens the door to all kind of relaxation, even to anarchy, and condemns implicitly the conduct of confessors and martyrs.

'8. It teaches, as Jesus Christ in several passages of the gospel, that in the Church the good are mingled with the bad, and rejects the error which affirms that the Church consists of the good and righteous only, (Prop. 72—78.) As inherent righteousness is an invisible thing, this is to make the Church in like manner invisible, and so to destroy all hierarchy, all subordination.

'9. As religion was established by oral teaching, and before the Scriptures were in being, the Constitution teaches that the reading of Holy Scripture in the vulgar tongue is not necessary to every one for salvation, and condemns the contrary error expressed in Propositions 79—86, which are so many outrages on the Church of God, as practising and teaching the opposite.

'10. It teaches that, in conformity with the practice of all the Church at all times, although it is proper to defer reconciliation or absolution of certain sinners, nevertheless there are others whom it is right to absolve at once, and before satisfaction. It teaches that all sinners, not excommunicated, ought to assist at the Sacrifice of the Mass; and it proscribes the opposite error, contained in Prop. 87—89, which blames the father of the family for receiving so promptly the prodigal son, and restoring to him his first robe; which blames Jesus Christ Himself, Who said to the penitent thief, "To day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise."

'11. It teaches that Jesus Christ, in giving to the apostles and to their successors the power to loose, gave them also the power to excommunicate, and that, as excommunication deprives of many benefits, it is always to be feared; consequently it condemns the opposite error contained in Propositions 90—93, which, supposing each individual the judge whether the sentence which condemns him be just or not, weaken the authority of the Church and render it contemptible.

'12. It teaches that, since Jesus Christ has promised to be with His Church alway, even unto the end, her administration is always holy, as being directed by the Holy Ghost, and it condemns those who deny and outrage it, as Prop. 94—101, which teach that the Church, become old and decrepit, is ignorant of, and can even persecute, the truth; when it may be impiously concluded that Christ, not having fulfilled his promise, is not only not God, but is not even a man of his word, (*mais pas même un homme*

de parole,) and that, finally, God, if there be one, does not meddle with the affairs of the world, and that all goes by chance.'

Such is M. Rohrbacher's abstract of the Constitution which filled Catholic Europe with consternation. Granted that some propositions of Quesnel are justly condemned, as those under the 10th head, there are some assertions of the Constitution, as those under the 3d, which were exclaimed against as pure Molinism; many more which are extremely doubtful; others which are mere philosophical speculations; by far the greater part of the errors imputed to Quesnel were unfairly wrung from his words; and the whole, whether right or wrong, was such a stretch of dogmatic authority in the Papal See as the Church had never yet beheld. M. Rohrbacher glories in the vast number of Bishops who at once accepted the *Unigenitus*. But, if we remember the then state of Europe, what else could we expect?—Spain, at the beck of Louis XIV.; Germany, exhausted by war; Portugal, at that time governed by the Jesuits. But in many cases, where received, it was not received without a struggle: three volumes have been written on the difficulties it experienced in the Austrian Low Countries; and in France the whole Church was shaken to its base.

As soon as the Bull arrived in that kingdom, Louis XIV. commanded the Bishops then in Paris to assemble, and to take it into their consideration. De Noailles presided. The Bull was read, and Quesnel was heard. The forty Bishops that composed the Synod accepted the Constitution; seventy of their brethren, then resident in their dioceses, followed their example; fourteen, (to whom two more were afterwards added,) including De Noailles, were opposed to it. Some of their *Mandemens* were censured by Rome, and suppressed by the King in Council. This was in 1714.

But the scene was about to change. In the following year, at ten o'clock on a stormy August night, Louis XIV. entered his death agony. The next morning, with the herald's proclamation, *Le Roi est mort! Vive le Roi!* fell the reign of Madame de Maintenon, and of the Molinists. Cardinal de Noailles reappeared at Court; and it was seriously debated in what way to oppose the publication of the *Unigenitus*.

'Appeals to the future council,' says a modern author, 'had always been usual. We find that even Nestorius remained unmolested between the convocation and the assembly of the Council of Ephesus. Innocent III. had said, on a subject of far less importance than the *Unigenitus*, If we should endeavour to decide anything on this point without the deliberation of a General Council, besides the offence to God, and the infamy in

‘the eyes of man, we should perchance incur danger to our
‘and office. But this doctrine of appeal to a future council did
‘suit more modern Pontiffs. Therefore Martin V. forbade all s
‘appeals, in a Bull of 1418; Pius II. (1459), in the Bull *Exec*
‘*bilis*; Julius II. (1509), in the Bull *Suscepti regiminis*; Greg
‘XIII., in the Bull *Consueverunt*; Paul V. in the Bull *I*
‘*toralis*; and, lastly, the famous Bull, *In Cœna Domini*. On
‘other hand, we find that, in 1239, Frederic II. appealed f
‘Gregory IV. to a General Council; in 1246, the Chu
‘of England made the same appeal from Alexander IV.
‘1264, the Bishops, in the Council of Reading, sanctioned
‘appeal “to the Pope in better times, or to a General Coun
‘and the Judge of all.” And after these Appeals were forbid
‘they still continued. In 1418, six weeks after the publica
‘of the Bull mentioned above, the Polish ambassadors appe
‘from a decision of its author to a General Council. In 1:
‘Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, did the same; so,
‘1460, did Sigismund, Duke of Austria, when excommunic
‘by Pius II; so, in 1472, did the Elector of Mayence, from
‘same Pius II.; in 1478, the Bishops of the Duchy of Flor
‘from Sixtus IV.; in 1509, the Venetian Republic from Clen
‘VII. As late as 1688, Archbishop de Harlay, and the l
‘versity of Paris, had appealed from Innocent XI. to a Gen
‘Council.’¹

It is clear that, if every one is to appeal about everyth
from the existing authority, the Church can never be gover
but while a General Council is sitting. But it is equally c
that if such an appeal is never to be allowed, the most extr
ultramontane theory is the only true one. Nor does it con
us now to determine what is the least occasion, or who
least important personage, that may authorise or may origi
such an appeal. We may content ourselves with this remark
If any circumstances could make it lawful, those of the Ch
under Clement XI. might. Great uneasiness, even where the
genitus was accepted,—in France, sixteen Bishops, one of t
the Archbishop of the Metropolis, ready to become appellan
the first theological school in Europe, the Sorbonne, jo
with them,—canons, abbots, clergy innumerable, ready to fo
their example: it needed only the courage to lead the way.

On the 1st of March, 1717, four Bishops—La Brou
Mirepoix, Soanen of Senez, Colbert of Montpellier, De l’A
of Boulogne—formally appealed from the *Unigenitus* to
future Œcumenical Council. The Faculty of Theology,
that of Arts, at once gave in their adhesion to the Appeal.
Faculties of Rheims, Nantes, and Poitiers did the same.
months later, Cardinal de Noailles and his Chapter, with el

¹ Landon's Trans. of Pereira's *Tentativa Theologica*, p. xxv.

of the Bishops, appealed. Clement XI. issued his Bull, *Pastoralis Officii*, whereby he cut off the appealing Prelates from his communion. The Appellants appealed again: whole religious communities joined them; chapters, isolated parish priests, laity, all united. The various Parliaments suppressed the *mandemens* of the ultramontane Bishops against the Appeal.

Amidst these commotions, the Cardinal de Noailles did not forget the surviving nuns of Port Royal. Six only remained: they were received, five into the House of Malnoue, one into that of Etrées. To the latter, Madame de Valais, the Cardinal wrote on the subject of her reception to Communion. His crime had been public—so should his penitence be; and he fixed the church of S. Geneviève for her reception, that it might be performed in the most solemn manner. The nun agreed to the place; but, to spare the Cardinal's feelings, appointed four in the morning as the time.

Had Clement XI. lived, it is difficult to guess what might have been the end of the controversy. The same Faculty of Theology, which had obliged John XXI. to retract his errors on the Beatific Vision, might have overthrown the Molinism of an Albani. But the timely concessions of Innocent XIII. and Benedict XIII., preceded as they had been by the accommodation of 1720, by which, in a measure, the *Unigenitus* was dropped, weakened the party of the Jansenists. One by one, the principal appellants withdrew their Appeal. The infamous Dubois (whom M. Rohrbacher converts into a respectable, if not a holy, man) lent the weight of his corruption to the same side. The Molinists had soon recovered ground enough to make an example of one of their principal opponents. Bishop Soanen of Senez, whom we have already mentioned as one of the four original Appellants, and whom we shall hereafter find one of the great supporters of the distressed Church of Utrecht—a Prelate now in the eighty-first year of his age, afforded his opponents an opportunity, by his Pastoral Instruction of August 18, 1726. He expressed himself so strongly, in this document, against Papal Infallibility and the *Unigenitus*, that the royal licence for a provincial Council was obtained. It was held at Embrun, in September 1727; De Tencin, Archbishop of that see presiding, assisted by his suffragans of Vence, Glandève, and Grasse, and the deputy of Digne. Other Bishops were present from the neighbouring provinces, to the number of sixteen in all; and Soanen was summoned to justify or to retract his Pastoral. He refused the jurisdiction of De Tencin, as notoriously elevated to his see by simony. The Council nevertheless proceeded; and, after various acts of injustice, on which it is unnecessary to dwell, condemned the Instruction, and suspended the Bishop on the 20th of September.

M. Rohrbacher lauds this Council to the skies, as recalling the primitive times of the Church. In one sense it does: one cannot read its proceedings without being reminded of the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus. Bishop Soanen was consigned, by a *Lettre de Cachet*, to the *Chaise Dieu*, whence he went, thirteen years afterwards, to the freedom of which a tyrannical monarch had deprived him on earth. He was not, however, left without advocates in the hour of his distress: thirty-one Prelates approved the Council; twelve however, one of whom was De Noailles, rejected it. The *Instruction* of the Bishop of Montpellier on the occasion in which he proves the invalidity of the sentence, is a very able work. De Tencin, president of the Council of Embrun, whose sister was the King's avowed mistress, was rewarded with the Archbishopric of Lyons, and a Cardinal's hat. It cannot, however, be denied that the party was much shaken by this proceeding; and still more so by the acceptance of the *Unigenitus*, which De Noailles, never a strong minded man, and now apparently in his dotage, published during the course of the next year.

We may fix 1727 as the period at which French Jansenism began to decline; though from another cause. In that year, a deacon, by name Paris, a man it would seem of holy life, and of some name among the opposers of the *Unigenitus*, was buried in the cemetery of S. Medard. It soon began to be reported that miracles were performed at his tomb. Whatever may now be said to the contrary, the belief was very general, and the witnesses unsuspected. Rollin, so well known in our schools, was convinced of the reality of some of the cures; and two, notwithstanding the sneers of M. Rohrbacher, who on this occasion imitates Gibbon successfully, do seem to be well authenticated,—that of Mademoiselle Lefranc, and of the lame man. But it is also most certain that false miracles began to be got up, and that with very little skill. A glazier, who had spoken ill of Paris, had his windows broken, by invisible hands, at night. The Duke of Anjou was poisoned by earth taken from the tomb. Soon a frenzy seized the most devoted adherents of the party. Men and women resorted in numbers to the cemetery. There they worked themselves up to a pitch of fanaticism; they leapt wildly about, they foamed at the mouth, they tore their hair and their clothes; there were groans, sobs, hysterics, and finally the most frightful contortions and convulsions. Sometimes a hundred of these devotees were fanaticising themselves at one time. The spectacle was most revolting; and the king very wisely caused the cemetery to be closed. The Jansenist epigram has more wit than truth:

'De par le Roi.—Défense à Dieu
De faire miracles en ce lieu.'

At once, by one of those strange contagions which physiology cannot as yet explain, *Convulsionists* appeared all over the country. They plunged more and more wildly into every kind of madness, and, it is to be feared, licentiousness; and a set of men appeared who, under the name of *sécouristes*, gave their assistance to the actors. Of the unhappy Convulsionists—almost always women,—some caused themselves to be publicly scourged, some threw themselves into water, and barked like a dog, some took upon themselves to confess men; till at length a young girl, as the delusion was wearing out, was actually persuaded to be *crucified*. This was on the Good Friday of 1758; and the spectacle was more than once repeated. The Père Cottu was the principal performer on these occasions; and the Sœur Françoise on one occasion remained for three hours on the cross. In the diocese of Lyons, as late as 1787, a girl was crucified in the parish church of Fareins, near Trevoux. We will quote an account of the proceedings of one of the Convulsionists, jotted down at the time, as recorded in a pamphlet put forth by the party.

‘Elle tint de la boue, se fait prendre les pieds, rendre petite, et ensuite élever. Elle se fait lier les bras en croix. Elle se fait lier les pieds et les mains ensemble. Elle se fait beaucoup serrer la gorge. Elle prend la main du Frère Nez, la serre pendant du temps. Elle fait comme lier les mains et les pieds au Frère Nez, ensuite le fait cacher derrière la tapisserie. Elle se fait soutenir en l’air par-dessous les bras, et fait la moue contre le Formulaire. Tout cela a été accompagné de vilaines grimaces. Elle s’est fait frapper très fort sur les jambes, en tranche et à-travers, ensuite elle l’a fait elle-même en tout son corps. Elle se renverse. Ses pieds étaient sur la tête du Frère J. B. Le Frère J. B. se dégage de dessous le Frère B.’¹

And so the recital proceeds. Truly, when one calls to mind the names of Jansenius, De Hauranne, Arnould, and Nicole, and the works by which they supported the cause of Augustinianism, and then turns to the extravagance of their miserable followers, one cannot but exclaim, ‘How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!’ Some of the predictions of these Convulsionists are, however, curious enough, considering what occurred within sixty years. One of them, addressing Paris, says:—

‘Tes heureux succès se changeront en pertes considérables. La famine et la peste ne seront pas les seuls fléaux qui te ravageront; la guerre qui s’allumera jusques dans tes murailles armera les citoyens contre les citoyens, le père contre le fils, l’enfant contre sa mère. L’armée ennemie qui paroîtra, fera cesser pour un temps tes divisions. En vain te mettras-tu en état de la repousser: pendant que tu attaqueras d’un côté, il entrera par l’endroit le plus foible de la ville.’

If the prophecy had ended there, it would have remarkably

¹ Recueil de Discours de plusieurs Convulsionnaires. 1734.

coincided with the conclusion of the campaign of 1814; but it unfortunately proceeds to describe the horrors of the sack that would ensue.

The party, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, split off into various sects, each vying with the other in profanity and fanaticism. There were the *Figurists*, who, in the cries of the Convulsionists, saw and explained a type of the sufferings of the Church; the *Discernants*, akin to the last; the *Vaillantists*, disciples of one Vaillant, who appeared in Provence, and expected the immediate coming of Elias; the *Margouillistes*, infamous for their debaucheries; the *Eliasites*, who, during the French Revolution, renewed the belief of the Vaillantists. Some ecclesiastics who had defended Convulsionism were alive under the reign of Napoleon.

But though these fearful excesses blasted the cause of Jansenism in France, we are not to imagine but that many excellent men graced its decline. Such were the Abbé Gaultier, Valla, Carcassonel, Duhamel, De Bellegarde, Petitpied, Cadry. Of the five bishops whom M. Rohrbacher points out as the chief supporters of the party during its fall, De Caylus of Auxerre was the most celebrated. During his long episcopate of fifty years, he pursued one consistent course; and he never retracted his appeal. While he believed in the miracles of Paris, and others, as Levier, of the parish of S. Leu, Noe-Menard, of the diocese of Nantes, and Duguet, he strongly reprobated Convulsionism. For fourteen years he was the only survivor of the appellants; and he maintained most friendly connexions with the Church of Utrecht. Of Colbert of Montpellier, we have already spoken. The other three were Fitz-James of Soissons, a son of the Duke of Berwick, Bossuet of Troyes, a nephew of the great Bossuet, but a man of doubtful character, De Montazet of Lyons, the latter of whom upheld till the French Revolution the same tenets for which S. Cyran and Soanen had suffered. He died in 1788.

Another mark of the decline of Jansenism was the unholy alliance it now made with the various Parliaments who persecuted those that refused communion to the appellants from the Unigenitus. It is the same scene over and over again. A priest refuses the viaticum to a Jansenist: the bishop supports him: the Parliament make an *arrêt* against the prelate: the King annuls the *arrêt*. In 1754 matters came between Louis XV. and the Parliament of Paris to that open rupture, which not obscurely heralded the French Revolution.

And here we may well draw the veil over French Jansenism. M. Rohrbacher sees in it the germ of the social dissolution of France. He regards Robespierre, Marat, and Danton as three celebrated Jansenists. The murder of Louis XVI. is, in his

eyes, a Jansenist outrage. The worship of Reason is the mere development of Jansenist theology. We may, perhaps, come to a somewhat opposite conclusion. The Molinist king, Louis XV., in the intervals of the seductions of La Pompadour, and the revolting licentiousness of the Parc-aux-Cerfs, persecutes Jansenist ecclesiastics, and condemns Jansenist tenets. The Molinist ecclesiastic Terray, one of the ministers of state, employs his utmost ability to stifle the remorse of the King in fresh scenes of, and incitements to, debauchery. A nobility that stigmatised Jansenism as belonging to the *canaille*, would not allow Lange to become the King's mistress, till one of themselves had married her for the purpose of ennobling her. Molinist Abbés, that had never taken orders, vied with each other in applauding the wit of Voltaire, or the sentiment of Rousseau. The Molinist head of a celebrated branch of the Cistercians, Nicolas Chaulatte, fifty-second Abbat of Pontigny, and *Primarius Pater* of the Order, was remarkable for the extreme elegance of the bouquets which he prepared for the boudoirs of his lady visitors, and for the charming manner in which he accompanied himself to the song *Du moment qu'on aime*. De Monsigny and de Gretry never heard their airs more delicately given than in the abbatial drawing-room. We have seen it in its ruins at Pontigny: that drawing-room which looks out on the church, so tremendous in its Cistercian and Transitional sternness, — the church which Hugh of Mâçon had founded, — where S. Thomas of Canterbury had prayed, and where S. Edmund rests. Are we, after all this, to look to Jansenism for the cause of the horrible dissolution of civil and ecclesiastical relations which showed itself so awfully around the dying bed of Louis XV.?

Having thus brought down the history of the Jansenists in France to its last stage, we must go back to the struggles of a national Church, which, adopting in some measure their doctrinal, and in the full extent their disciplinary, views, remains to the present day persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed. We allude, of course, to that of Utrecht.¹

¹ The history of this Church is to be learnt from the following sources:—Kemp's abridged History, in 3 vols. 12mo. is the best work; but it is written in Dutch. The *Histoire Abrégée de l'Eglise Métropolitaine d'Utrecht*, Utrecht, 1765, published anonymously, but from the pen of the Abbé de Bellegarde, is a very interesting book. The *Batavia Sacra* (1st ed. Brussels, 1714) a noble monument of ecclesiastical learning, gives, in its second part, from p. 14 to p. 112, and from p. 457 to p. 532, the lives of the Archbishops and Vicars Apostolic from Schenk to Daemen. The author is Hugh Francis Van Heussen, of whom we shall have occasion to speak. The *Historia Episcopatum Federati Belgii*, by the same writer, in 2 vols. folio, Antwerp, 1755, contains many important particulars. The following polemical works throw most light on the subject. The

It is a daughter of our own Church, owing for its apostle the Englishman S. Willibrord. At first independent, then a suffragan of Cologne, the see of Utrecht enjoyed, in fact, a dignity and preeminence almost more than metropolitical. Its distance from the city of the Three Kings, its immense wealth, its temporal dominion, all conduced to this result. The province of Utrecht belonged in full sovereignty to the Bishop; whether so given by Charlemagne, or at a later period, is a point in dispute, and is not material to our present subject. What is more material is, that the Chapter of Utrecht enjoyed the free and uncontrolled right of choosing their own Bishop from the earliest times, and maintained it to the latest. The constitution of this Chapter was somewhat peculiar. It contained five subordinate chapters, that of the magnificent cathedral, and of the four collegiate churches of S. Saviour, S. Mary, S. Peter, and S. John. Nor is it wonderful that these ecclesiastics should have retained their right to a free election, when concordats and sanctions of all kinds were making other Bishops the nominees of the Pope or of the Sovereign. The possessions of the Church of Utrecht stood her at least in this good stead. The lords of the Low Countries dared not to risk the loss of influence in that province, by attempting to turn that influence into supremacy.

It is not wonderful that lands and riches should have had their usual effect in the corruption of this great Church. Counts, marquises, and younger sons of sovereign families stand thick on the rolls of its prelates; and at the same time, during the fifteenth century, discontent was spreading, heresy was fostered, luxury increased to a scandalous degree. At length, in the year 1528, Henry of Bavaria, having been four years Bishop, but not yet consecrated, the Chapters, setting a nobler example than might have been expected from the age, ceded their tem-

Defensio Ecclesiæ Ultrajectinæ per J. C. Erkelium, Amsterdam, 1728. The *Causa Coddæana*, Antwerp, 1705. The four *Tractatus Historici*, auctore Nicolao Broedersen, Delft, 1729. The *Motivum Juris* and *Refutatio responsi ad Motivum* of the great Van Espen. The *Mémoire pour l'Eglise et le Clergé d'Utrecht*, Paris, 1716. The first and second Apologies of the Bishop of Babylon, a very able work. On the Ultramontane side, the *Historia de rebus Ecclesiæ Ultrajectensis*, Cologne, 1725, is worth reading. It has no author's name, but is the work of Cornelius Hoyneck Van Papendrecht, and gave occasion to the replies of Erkel and Broedersen. Of a more moderate character is the *Storia e Sentimento dell' Abbate Tosini, sopra il Giansenismo*, 1717. To all these should be added,—The Life of Zeger Bernard Van Espen, prefixed to the fifth volume of his works, Louvain, 1767; and certain passages from the *Mémoires Historiques sur l'Histoire de la Bulle Unigenitus dans les Pays-Bas Autrichiens*, 1755. A very convenient survey of the whole History, (though now out of print,) is the little book that stands third on our list. It is the work of the present Venerable Archbishop of Utrecht, John van Santen. Dr. Tregelles' account of the Church of Holland is simply taken from this abridgment, without, it would seem, reference to any other History.

poral sovereignty to the Emperor Charles V., saving all the other rights of their church, and among them that of free election of their Bishops. It will be seen in the sequel that we are not unnecessarily dwelling on this point.

Calvinism rolling over the seventeen provinces like a flood, the creation of new bishoprics was proposed by Philip V., and executed by Paul IV. The extent of territory for which the provision had been hitherto insufficient, may be judged from the fact that on one side Osnaburg, on another Paderborn, on another Rheims, (the latter in its diocesan character,) was affected by the new arrangements. Utrecht now found itself a metropolitical see, with five suffragans, Haarlem, Deventer, Leeuwarden, Groningen, and Middelburg. Even here, however, something of the jealousy of Rome may be discovered. The primacy of Belgium, instead of being given to the ancient see of S. Willibrord, S. Gregory, and S. Frederic, was conferred on the new creation of Mechlin, a city hitherto not even episcopal.

Under such circumstances, Frederic Schenck, sixty-first Bishop, became third¹ Archbishop of the see of Utrecht. But heresy was advancing with rapid strides; his suffragans were scarcely received or acknowledged in their sees; the new creations were looked on as the mere result of Spanish policy,—and it must be confessed that the installation of a Bishop under the protection of the Duke of Alva was not precisely the most likely way of evangelising a diocese. At length the last argument was called in on both sides, and the revolt became general. Let us reprobate, if we will, the persecution carried on by the Duke of Alva. But that popular piece of history, Watson's Philip II., has not so much truth in it as Macaulay's romance, nor half so much as one of Scott's historical novels. We must never forget that Alva's severities, whatever they were, were almost rivalled by those of his enemies, and far exceeded by the Anabaptists; that the Catholics² were basely deluded into the revolt by the promise of a free toleration—a promise broken with so abominable a perfidy as to call forth the strongest expressions of blame from the more honest writers of the party; and finally, that, as Brandt himself confesses, it was rather, on the reformed side, a war of commerce than a struggle for religion. Its result we all know. The Archbishop lived to see the abolition of the public exercise of the Catholic Faith in Utrecht, June 18, 1580; and in two months after died of a broken heart.

¹ Third, because S. Willibrord and S. Boniface are reckoned Arch-bishops.

² Brandt confesses as much as this; and the documents which prove it may be found in *Pièces touchant les Catholiques sujets des Etats des Provinces-Unies*. Nor must it ever be forgotten that the Act of Union of the States-General, Jan. 9, 1577, expressly states that it is made 'for the preservation of our Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Faith, for the expulsion of the Spaniards,' &c.

His province was in the wildest confusion; his suffragans were vainly endeavouring to gather together some faint relics of their flocks; Nieulant of Haarlem in exile; Deventer governed by a Grand Vicar; Leeuwarden, Bishop deceased and Chapter fled; Nylen feebly maintaining himself at Groningen; Streyn, a man of great energy and prudence, administering as Grand Vicar the diocese of Middelburg, to which he was afterwards consecrated.

The Chapter of Utrecht¹ thus found itself at the helm of the Church of Holland. A series of negotiations took place for the appointment of an Archbishop; but difficulties intervened, and after some other nominations of a Grand Vicar, SASBOLD VOSMER, a name ever to be held in veneration, was elected by the Chapter to that office, in 1583. He set himself with energy to comfort the feeble-minded, to support the weak, to correct notorious offenders; and he had the satisfaction of finding his endeavours gradually successful. He, indeed, never beheld the full result of his labours; for the Clergy of Holland, which at the 'abolition' of the Catholic religion had numbered 600, went on diminishing all his life, till in the year of his death they were reduced to 170. But his successors reaped the benefit of what he had sown. Made Vicar Apostolic in 1589, he used his extended influence for the extension of the Church; he never ceased to urge the re-establishment of the Archiepiscopate of Utrecht, representing both to the Pope, and also to the Archduke Albert, (still regarded *de jure* as the sovereign of the United Provinces,) that no effectual progress could be made without two national Bishops, or at least one. In ineffectual attempts to procure this blessing, seventeen years passed by. The Jesuits, who in 1592 entered into that country of which they afterwards became the curse, opposed with all their might a national episcopate. When Sasbold Vosmer determined to go to Rome for the purpose of obtaining it, their indignation knew no bounds; and they treated as *Sasboutians* all who demanded a national Church. Vosmer's journey was procrastinated by a severe illness, which the physicians attributed to poison. He himself always believed that poison to have been administered by the Jesuits; and whoever is acquainted with the history of those miserable schismatics in Holland, will allow that the accusation does them no injustice on the score of improbability. On his recovery, Vosmer went to Rome, and was there, by an

¹ Of the other Chapters, the History is briefly told. That of Haarlem will repeatedly come before us: at length, as we shall see, won over by the Ultramontane party, it ceased to exercise any jurisdiction, though perpetuating itself, we believe, to the present time. That of Deventer existed, for the most part at Oldenzaal, till 1665. The other three did not survive the first fury of the Reformation.

express command of the Pope, induced to accept the See of Utrecht. A capital mistake was, that he received it at the nomination of the Archduke Albert, the Chapter only acquiescing. Many of the letters which he wrote from Rome are still extant. In one of them he mentions a conversation which he held with the Pope respecting the Molinist controversy, then, as we have seen, raging, and reports that Clement had said, 'I am ready to suffer martyrdom, if need be, for the doctrine of S. Augustine.' In others he refers to the difficulty of choosing his title. It was at one time proposed that he should be Bishop of Haarlem; but at length it was determined that he should be Archbishop of Utrecht, *under the title* (not to offend the States-General) of Archbishop of Philippi. Could he have foreseen the disastrous consequences which were to result to his Church from this piece of caution, we may be very sure that he would never have submitted to it. He was consecrated at Rome by the Cardinal Bishop of Albano, September 22, 1602.

It is a matter of the most vital consequence to the following history to show that Vosmer was really Archbishop of Utrecht under the title of Archbishop of Philippi; and not, as the Ultramontanes say, merely Vicar Apostolic with a title *in partibus*. It can be shown satisfactorily; but we throw the proofs into a note.¹ This, to use the vulgar expression, is one of the two *hitches* in the history of the Church of Holland. Still, whatever the Jesuits have said since, they at that time recognised his title. For, when they received certain intelligence of

¹ It is proved :—1. By the report which Vosmer gives of the negotiations at the time, before any important consequences seemed to hang on the question: the truth of this report never having been for a moment questioned. 2. By the fact that the States proceeded against him for exercising the office, and assuming the title of Archbishop of Utrecht: with an Archbishop of Philippi they would not have concerned themselves. 3. That it was given to him without the least scruple or doubt by his enemies the Jesuits. 4. That he constantly assumed it himself, sometimes singly, sometimes in addition to the title of Philippi: twenty of his acts, thus denominating him, are quoted in the *Defensio Ecclesie Ultrajectinae*. 5. That in official acts of the Archduke Albert he is so characterised. But, except for the great importance of the subject, it would be quite superfluous to adduce any proofs of what can only be impudently denied. His very epitaph begins :—'Illust. et Reverendiss. D.D. Sasboldo Vosmero Delphio, Archiepisc. Philipp. et Ultraject.', &c. Hoyneck is sorely put to it to invalidate Vosmer's claims. First, he says that it would have been a piece of cowardice in the Pope to have created him Archbishop of one city under the title of another. So, very possibly, it was. We are not required to pronounce any opinion. Then he attempts to demonstrate from Vosmer's own words his mere Vicariate; with what success, let the following passage show. Vosmer says :—'Verum hactenus, licet ab hæreticis habear et dicar Ultrajectinus, non assumpsi titulum Ultrajectensem, sed usus sum ut sequitur; *Dei et Apostolicæ Sedis gratiâ Archiepiscopus Philippensis nec non Ultrajectensis, et Hollandiæ, et unitarum, et nuper reductarum Transisulanæ Provinciarum Vic. Apost.*' Hoyneck, in spite of sense, grammar, and construction, joins *Vicarius Apostolicus* to *Ultrajectensis*, thus making a title purely nonsensical. A cause that needs such arguments must indeed be hopeless.

his intended consecration, they had the abominable wickedness to denounce him to the States General as having accepted the Archbishopric of Utrecht from the Archduke Albert, and therefore as guilty of high treason. The result was a sentence of banishment, dated May 30, 1602, and signed by the despicable Maurice of Orange. Vosmer, on this, took up his abode at Cologne. Here he directed with the greatest prudence the affairs of his province, together with those of the dioceses of Ruremonde and Bois-le-Duc, also intrusted to him.

The Jesuits, meanwhile, having a door open to their machinations, ceased not to vex in every possible way the secular clergy. Their conduct at length grew so insufferable, that the Archbishop was obliged to interfere. By an ordinance of the 16th of December, 1609, he prohibited them, on pain of excommunication, from any further intermeddling with the pastoral office, and received the reward that he might have expected. They denounced him to Rome, as having, *ipso facto*, incurred deposition; and Cardinal Mellini wrote to him, informing him that he must revoke his Pastoral, and must consider himself suspended from his functions of Vicar Apostolic. Vosmer returned an elaborate defence. Mellini replied that his Holiness was satisfied; that the suspension was at an end; but that the Pastoral must still be recalled. Vosmer refused to do so; and finally the Court of Rome gave way.

It is a pleasing picture which is presented by the letters and journals of this prelate, the latter commencing with the prayer of Nehemiah, 'Remember me, O my God, for good, and wipe not out my good deeds that I have done for the house of my God, and for the offices thereof.' To his brother, Tilman, he unbosoms himself as a most affectionate correspondent. We find him ministering with his own hands to the sick, in the plague that, during the year 1610, devastated Oldenzaal and Lingen; and, at a later period, visiting the Hague at the hazard of his life, and there confirming his future successor, James de la Torre. At length, worn out with fatigues, and full of merits, he departed to his rest, on the 30th of May, 1614, while the 31st Psalm was being read to him. He is said, like S. Charles Borromeo, to have written 11,000 pastoral epistles with his own hand. His cenotaph may be seen by the visitors to the Cathedral of Cologne.

Philip Rovenius, Dean of Oldenzaal, was nominated by the Chapter, now reduced to about forty priests, Grand Vicar. Paul V. at once named him Vicar Apostolic. As no sentence of banishment was pronounced against him, he took up his

¹ Even Hoyneck says that he died, 'cum non vulgaris pietatis opinione.'

abode at Utrecht. The new head of the Church of Holland was in the fortieth year of his age; imbued with the principles of Vosmer, and, like him, abhorred by the Jesuits. Another unfortunate series of negotiations took place with the Archduke Albert: his agreement to the nomination of Rovenius as archbishop was earnestly asked; but, in consideration of the truce which he had concluded with the States, and for the infraction of which he was determined to afford no pretext, he would not give that consent which should never have been requested. In the meantime, the Catholic faith prospered at Utrecht; forty priests said mass there daily, and there had been, in the city and its suburbs, till the year 1613, eighteen abbeys and convents which partially retained their revenues. But the magistrates, irritated by the absurd imprudence of a Jesuit named Leeuw, abolished them in that year, only allowing a pension to nuns of above thirty years' profession. Rovenius was no sooner consecrated than he was banished as his predecessor had been; but his Deanery of Oldenzaal afforded him a convenient residence in his own province. This foundation, the Southwell of Holland, was at this time in the possession of the king of Spain, by whom it was not lost till 1626. We have an affecting account of the last mass said by the archbishop in the Collegiate Church of S. Plechelm, after which the altars were stripped, and the place surrendered to the Calvinistic soldiery. In this same year Cornelius Jansen first makes his appearance in connexion with the Church of Holland. As he was about to visit Spain, the two Chapters solicited, through him, the confirmation of Rovenius by Philip III. to the See of Utrecht.

A regulation of Rovenius, imperatively called for by the times, has been made the ground of Ultramontane cavils against the rights of the Church of Holland. At the Reformation,—and this was one of the few honourable proceedings which characterised it,—the canonries of the five chapters were not suppressed, nor were the then holders deprived of them. As they became vacant, Protestants were admitted to them as to honourable sinecures; though Catholics were also occasionally presented. In both cases the ancient usages were preserved; and the succession was perpetuated by collations *ad turnum*, presentations, and resignations, as before. This mongrel body still continued to hold its chapters for the purpose of managing its estates, and keeping up the fabric of the cathedral; while the Catholic part of it, as we have seen, held *their* separate meetings for the transaction of the ecclesiastical business of the diocese. At length, in 1622, when of the 285 canons and vicars who composed the five chapters only 45 were Catholics, the States of the province of Utrecht passed a resolution that

none but Protestants should for the future be presented to the vacant dignities. Rovenius was thus thrown into great perplexity. If no fresh canons were appointed, the Catholic chapter, and with it the Church of Utrecht, would soon be at an end. If fresh appointments were made, the States would be irritated, and all named to the vacant offices would be banished. The archbishop therefore chose seven of the then existing canons; to these added the few priests whom he had intended to appoint to the dignities which should fall vacant in his own months; and these he formed into what he named a *Vicariate* of eleven ecclesiastics (since reduced to nine), but which was, in truth, the Chapter under another title. Ultramontane writers have treated this step as altogether null. They have argued that, when the last Catholic of the old chapter died, the chapter was at an end, and the right of nomination had lapsed to the Pope. But supposing that the proceeding were not perfectly regular, is a church which, like the Lion of the States, might have for its motto, *Luctor et emergo*,—a church struggling with persecution, beset with heretics, to be tied down to the 'most straitest' rules of peace and worldly prosperity? Van Espen, however, has left it as his judgment, that all was most perfectly canonical, and that the proceeding might stand the investigation of any discipline in any time.¹ The reason why the new body was so small was, that, of the Catholic canons, many were not in orders, and more exiles. The former had been presented by the States, to whom, of course, ecclesiastic or layman came alike.

Notwithstanding the imminent peril he incurred, Rovenius fixed his abode at Utrecht. The lady who gave him shelter at the risk of confiscation of her property, was Henrietta Davenvorden,—a name which deserves to be recorded. When the war was raging most fiercely, and the Prince of Orange had taken Bois-le-Duc on the one side, while the Royal Army had obtained possession of Amersfoort on the other, the danger became very great. There were even two martyrdoms,—one at Utrecht,² the other at Middelburg. Rovenius, however, remained at his post. It is impossible to refrain from noticing the immense labours which this great prelate underwent. He saw the number of the secular priests increase from 170 to 400; that of the Catholic laity from 200,000 to 300,000. He had to give a new form to the religious houses for women. Distinct communities, and a marked dress, were out of the question; but under the name of *clopies* they lived at home, went out into the

¹ Hoynck has an excursus on the question, 'An Vicariatus Ultrajectensis a Philippo Rovenio et Jacobo Turrio institutus, sit verum Capitulum Ecclesie Ultrajectensis.' (Pp. 196—206.) Nothing can be weaker, or more confirmatory of the truth of the opposite cause.

² That of Andrew de Cock, 1636, and that of Martin Vanvelde, Mar. 6, 1639.

villages, catechised, gave alms, and effected more conversions than the priests. These *clopies* were a subject of the most furious placards, on the part of their High Mightinesses: they were forbidden, under the severest penalties, to assemble in any numbers exceeding two; they were incapable of making a will, &c. This law, however, was not carried out at Haarlem, Delft, Amsterdam, and Utrecht, where there was a kind of Beguinage, known as *The Corner*, which was connived at by the magistrates. Rovenius was also the institutor of an order of lay controversialists, which rendered the most essential service to the Catholic priests.

We must not dwell on the other deeds and hairbreadth escapes of this servant of God. Suffice it to say that, from the beginning to the end of his career, he was bitterly persecuted by the Jesuits, who obliged him to visit Rome, did their utmost to deprive him of his see, and the Church of Holland of her life. In 1641, in consequence of his great age, James de la Torre was elected by the Chapters of Utrecht and Haarlem, (the latter church claiming a part in the election, having no pastor of her own,) as his coadjutor; and he was consecrated under the title of Archbishop of Ephesus. The last years of the archbishop's life were peaceful; he died the death of the righteous, at Utrecht, in the seventy-eighth year of his age, 1651, and was buried in the house of Madame Davenvorden.¹

On the episcopate of James de la Torre, under the title of Archbishop of Ephesus, it will not be necessary to dwell. Banished, like his predecessors, he took up his abode at Antwerp; and there, having neither the clear-sightedness nor the courage of his predecessors, he fell into the toils of the Jesuits. The privileges he bestowed on them are known by the name of the *Concessiones Ephesinæ*. The remonstrances of his Clergy produced their effect; and he went to Rome, with partial success, to obtain a recognition of the rights of his See. He was afterwards, by the hope of richer preferment, inveigled into new concessions. Chagrin brought on hypochondria; that degenerated into madness: and de la Torre died in confinement, Sept. 16, 1661. Zachary de Metz had been uncanonically appointed his coadjutor, under the title of Bishop of Tralles, without consent of the Chapters, but after outraging the rights of the ecclesiastics, both of Utrecht and Haarlem, he died before the Archbishop.

Some complicated negotiations, into which it is not necessary to enter, saw Baldwin de Catz, Archbishop of Utrecht, under the title of Archbishop of Philippi, and John de Neercassel, Bishop of Haarlem, under the title of Bishop of Castoria. The former, however, whose consecration had been irregular, and

¹ In our copy of the *Batavia Sacra*, some former possessor has inserted a very interesting and apparently contemporary picture of Rovenius, as he lay in state.

who is consequently not reckoned in the Archiepiscopal list, shortly after died; and De Neercassel, retaining the title under which he had been consecrated, became Archbishop of Utrecht. He is considered the greatest prelate who ever occupied that see. He received distinguished honours from the States, and was acknowledged by them in his character of prelate. The Jesuits now for the first time brought forward their accusation of Jansenism against the Church of Utrecht. Five propositions were extracted from the writings of De Neercassel, and delated to the Inquisition, by which they were pronounced free from all censure; but a journey to Rome was necessary before all suspicions were wiped off. The victories of Louis XIV. were now alarming the States; and to prevent the formation of a party in favour of French domination, they hastened to propitiate the Catholics. In 1672, the Cathedral was restored to them; it was reconciled; and for some time De Neercassel performed within it the functions of Ordinary. His sermons, in particular, were attended by a vast concourse of persons. The Catholics of Holland had now increased to 500,000, about a fourth of the whole population; and there seemed every probability that this country would ere long return to the Church. God had ordered it otherwise. The reverses experienced by Louis XIV. freed the States-General from their apprehensions; the Cathedral was again taken from the Catholics; and De Neercassel thought it best to retire to Hüssen, in the Duchy of Cleves. He drew on himself a fresh persecution by the publication of his book, called *Amor Pœnitens*; it was delated to the Inquisition, and forbidden, 'till corrected.' The obnoxious passage was one which seemed to declare, in opposition to the Council of Trent, that the fear of the pains of hell, in and by itself, is a sin. Innocent XI., however, suspended the decree, saying, *Il libro è buono, e l'autore è uno Santo*. Under his successor the censure was made public.

De Neercassel laboured at another point of no small importance, with great success. It had been the general opinion in the Church of Holland, that the presence of a priest was essential to the validity of marriage. Nothing irritated the Protestants so much as to be told that all their marriages were merely legalised adulteries, all their children illegitimate, all their lives one long series of immorality. Again, if a wife were converted to the Church, she was bound to leave her husband till remarried, and on his refusal to be remarried, was at liberty to be married to any one else, and so *vice versa*. De Neercassel was the first to elaborate what is now the practice of the Roman Church in the like case. Distinguishing the natural and civil contract from the sacrament, he allowed that all marriages celebrated

according to the laws of the country were valid, and hence obligatory and indissoluble; though they should afterwards be hallowed, in case of conversion, by the benediction of the Church. This was approved by the Roman Penitentiary in 1671: and finally, the same doctrine, after having been taught by Van Espen, was made the law of the Roman Church by Benedict XIV. in 1741.

The revocation of the Edict of Nantes brought fresh persecution on the Church of Holland. The churches in Friesland were even closed for a year. But with that exception, De Neercassel's latter days were peaceful. His clergy maintained the highest character; Guelderland only, and the Duchy of Cleves, where the free exercise of the Catholic religion was allowed, were exceptions; the disorders of the Chapter of Emmeric were scandalous. This was owing to the reprehensible manner in which the Elector of Brandenburg, a prince worthy of the line of Prussia, disposed of his benefices.

In April 1686, the Archbishop determined to make a general visitation of his diocese. He travelled either on foot or in a peasant's wagon, though in the 61st year of his age: his companion was Bartholomew Pesser, a priest. He had a presentiment that he should never return. The little diary which this servant of God kept of his visitation, and which is still extant, is very interesting. Its conclusion may serve as a specimen of his labours. He is in Westphalia:

'May 12.—At Glan. Preached before a large audience, and administered the sacrament of Confirmation to 1,400 Catholics. May 13.—Preached again: and confirmed as many as yesterday. 14.—Came a priest of Deventer to me, with a Minorite, resident in Velaw. 15.—Consoled the sisters in Glan, under their sufferings and poverty; and presided at the election of a prioress: Sister Columba Terhoent chosen. 16.—Confirmed about a hundred men. Their devotion truly admirable. The continued heavy rain did not prevent their coming, some from a great distance. Bade farewell to the pastors, and addressed the sisters, and reminded them of their duties; afterwards heard their confessions. These sisters, pious and simple-minded, thoroughly content in the state of poverty. 17.—Celebrated, confirmed one of the sisters, left Glan, and came to Lingen. 18.—At Dermpt, near Lingen. Celebrated, preached, confirmed about 300 persons. The chief inhabitants of the place, not Catholics, present at the sermon.'

Here the journal ends. The Archbishop, in a very hot summer, pursued his course through the province of Overysse; and the capital, Zwolle, was its limit. He was seized with fever, and on the 6th of June rested from his labours. He gave up his soul to God with great resignation, just as the priest was reading those words, *My soul shall be satisfied as it were with marrow and fatness, when my mouth praiseth Thee with joyful lips.* He was buried in the Convent of Glan, where less than a month before he had laboured.

The Chapters elected Hugh Francis Van Heussen, Canon of Utrecht, and the learned author of the *Batavia Sacra*, to the archbishopric. They had already chosen him Coadjutor; but, owing to the machinations of the Jesuits, had not yet obtained the Pope's confirmation. As soon as his election was known, the Jesuits delated to the Inquisition a work published by him on Indulgences; and it was condemned. The decree was indeed so hurried and informal that, amidst other blunders, the name of the author was misspelt. The Chapters, however, fearing that this would be an insuperable barrier to Van Heussen's confirmation, named three other subjects, the first of whom was Peter Codde, Canon and Pro-Vicar of Utrecht, without desisting from their demand for the confirmation of Van Heussen;—the Jesuits redoubled their efforts, accused all four of Richerism and Jansenism; and the affair was committed to a congregation of six Cardinals. The Jesuits then first openly avowed their design of destroying the national Church of Holland. It was proposed to subject that country to two Vicars Apostolic, to be chosen without reference to the Chapters. But the Pope maintained the rights of that persecuted Church; and after a delay of three years, Peter Codde was elected by the Congregation from the four nominees of the Chapters. Two other particulars remain to be noticed: that the Cardinal Colonna, a member of the Congregation, spoke of the Church of Holland as the most flourishing in Christendom; and that Theodore de Cock, afterwards its bitter enemy and persecutor, was procurator for the Chapters during all these negotiations.

The first twelve years of Codde's Episcopate were spent in the active performance of its offices. We find, however, the effects of the schism which the Jesuits were fomenting, in the retarded progress of the Church. The conversions were now reckoned at from 200 to 250 annually; but the apostasies amounted to from 150 to 200. The enumeration which the Archbishop gives of the various sects of the country is not without its interest. He reckons them thus: 1,500,000 Calvinists (but it is thought that 1,300,000 would have been a truer computation); 530,000 Catholics; 80,000 Lutherans; 160,000 Anabaptists; 70,000 Socinians and Deists; 60,000 Remonstrants; 25,000 Jews.

On the eve of his consecration, Codde had refused to sign the Formulary of Alexander VII., prescribed to him, without any order of the Pope, by the Internuncio at Brussels. This, and the kind reception which Arnauld had experienced in Holland, were handles of which the Jesuits did not delay availing themselves. The negotiations of Ryswick afforded them the means of disseminating their accusations. The Congregation for the affairs of Holland determined to substitute Theodore de Cock,

as Vicar Apostolic, and to require the appearance of Codde at Rome, on a charge of Baianism and Jansenism. But there were two difficulties. It seemed degrading to treat the Archbishop of a great national Church as a suspected criminal; and Leo X. had, by a particular privilege, engaged that all cases which concerned the Church of Utrecht should be settled on the spot, and not at Rome. It was therefore determined to invite Codde to be present at the Jubilee of 1700. He excused himself, till he found that the invitation was a command; and then, very unwillingly, took his departure, in the company of five or six of his ecclesiastics. In the mean time, Cardinal Albani, the creature of the Jesuits, had become Pope, under the title of Clement XI.; and the Archbishop found himself at the bar of a Congregation, first of three, then of ten Cardinals. It is said, that the question being put, whether he should be suspended from his Vicariate Apostolic, the numbers were five and five, and that the Pope decided in his favour. But this resolution was, at the instance of his adversaries, reconsidered; and the result was a brief, of May 13, 1702, by which Clement XI., without assigning any reason, suspended Codde from the exercise of his functions, and appointed the traitor Theodore de Cock, Pro-Vicar in the United Provinces. This suspension, according to the famous Roman canonist, Hyacinthus de Archangelis, was in itself unjust; but when it is considered that the Pope also intended to suspend Codde from the functions of Archbishop of Utrecht, it becomes a crying injustice, which alone would render the memory of Clement for ever odious.¹

While Codde was vainly demanding the names of his accusers, and the heads of their charges, De Cock wrote to the Archbishop's Grand Vicars, (he had left four,) claiming their obedience. They, in the name of their Chapters, refused to recognise him; and thus the schism was consummated. Very shortly afterwards, the adherents of the National Church and the partizans of Cock openly abstained from communion. The National Clergy protected themselves from all ill consequences by appealing to the Pope better informed. The States-General interfered. They interdicted Cock from all exercise of his functions, and, knowing that Codde was virtually a prisoner, commanded his instant return. If that were delayed, they would imprison De Cock, and banish all Jesuits. Clement XI., whose functions were confined to the bullying of Jansenists and Richerists, had nothing to say to Dutch burgomasters; and Codde, after receiving every assurance of his good-will, was permitted to go back.

¹ The particulars of these transactions, as recorded by a member of the Church of Utrecht, may be read in the *Divers Abus et Nullités du Décret de Rome, du 4 Octobre, 1707*, published in 1708; and in the *Causæ Coddæanæ*, Antwerp, 1705.

At this time the Ultramontane party first devised their since famous assertion that the Chapters of Utrecht and Haarlem had ceased to exist. It is believed that the Internuncio of Brussels first proposed it in a letter of Jan. 25, 1703. The arguments by which the Chapter of Utrecht was attacked, were principally these three:—1. Granting that body to exist, it had surrendered its right to elect its Archbishop, together with its cession of temporal sovereignty, to Charles V. 2. Or, supposing it not to have done so then, it had virtually done so when Sasbold Vosmer was consecrated Archbishop of Philippi, and acted as Vicar Apostolic. 3. Or, granting him and his successor to have been true Archbishops of Utrecht, the Chapter came to an end when Rovenius substituted for it his Vicariate. The second of these arguments was that which was most insisted on: but we have seen how triumphantly all these objections have been answered. But now the Jesuits devised a fourth argument of so wonderful a nature, that it is really worth repeating. Up to the Treaty of Münster, said they, Holland had a national Episcopate, because up to that time its sovereignty was *de jure* vested in a Catholic king. But from the cession of its sovereignty to their High Mightinesses, it could only be governed by Vicars Apostolic, because there can only be a national Episcopate where the Sovereign is Catholic:—a maxim curiously contradicted by the late proceedings of Pius IX.

Of the three courses now open to Codde—blind submission—retaining his Archiepiscopate as distinct from his Vicariate Apostolic—or abstaining from all exercise of authority, while maintaining his rights—he unfortunately chose the third. The wiser part of his friends, and among them Van Espen, who henceforward becomes intimately allied to the history of the Church of Holland, in vain pressed the adoption of the second. The very portrait of Codde shows that he had not resolution to abstain from a compromise. After a long struggle, both parties agreed in the nomination of Gerard Potcamp to the Vicariate, but this excellent man had hardly begun to restore peace, when he was called from the world. Codde persisting in his resolution, and the Chapter of Haarlem having taken a similar one, the Chapter of Utrecht named Catz and Van Heussen Grand Vicars. On the other hand, the Nuncio at Cologne consecrated Adam Daemen under the title of Archbishop of Adrianople, Vicar Apostolic. The schism openly broke out. Daemen forbade his adherents to communicate with the other party in their life, or to pray for them after their death. The clergy protested and appealed. Three years afterwards, Dec. 19, 1710, Codde was called to that place ‘where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest.’

Now, indeed, Rome seemed to have triumphed. Daemen having abdicated, the Nuncio summoned M. Van Erkel, Canon of Utrecht, and the ablest supporter next to Van Espen of that Church, to appear before him, and on his refusal, excommunicated him. Next, he issued a pastoral instruction on the schism, and forbade his adherents to receive from a priest of the National Church any of the Sacraments which require jurisdiction, as Penance, or Marriage, except Penance in the article of death, and pronounced null and void the past and future administration of such Sacraments. Besides the open violation of Canon Law, which allows the validity of all sacraments administered *lite pendente*, this Nuncio, recognising marriages celebrated by a Protestant minister, invalidated those performed by a priest of the National Church. The furious invectives of the young Jesuits almost surpass credibility. One taught that it was better to go to a Calvinist temple than to a Jansenist Church; another, that Jansenist baptism no more availed to remission of sins than did circumcision.

In the mean time negotiations were carried on with the Nuncio Bussi, soon after rewarded with a Cardinal's hat, at Cologne. Sometimes he insisted that the Chapter should recognise its own nullity; sometimes, that it should sign the formula, as required by the new Bull, '*Vineam Domini Sabaoth.*' The Chapter had its choice:—delation, persecution, excommunication, on the one hand; promotion, wealth, favour of the Court of Rome, on the other. They saw Bussi a cardinal;—they knew what Vosmer, Rovenius, De Neercassel, and Codde had suffered. They saw the memory of the last Prelate branded by the Court of Rome as heretical. And there were not wanting those who would have had them take warning from the fate of those bishops. But they answered in the spirit, if not in the words, of their countryman, Van Artevelde,—

'But had they thought—or could they but have dream'd
The great examples that they died to show
Should fall so flat, should shine so lifeless here,
That men should say, "For liberty these died,
Wherefore let us be slaves,"—oh! with what shame,
Their blushing faces buried in the dust,
Had their great spirits parted hence for Heaven!'

The government of the Papal adherents was now divided between the Internuncio at Brussels, and the Nuncio at Cologne:—the former merely taking those functions which would not expose him to civil punishment; the latter, being out of the way of danger, administering those which contravened the law. This truly apostolic arrangement was worked to the utmost for the oppression of the Church of Holland; and a majority of the

Chapter of Haarlem was by promises and threats won to the Ultramontane side. One ecclesiastic of that party, however, set himself in earnest, and with a great portion of fairness, to bring about a reconciliation. This was the Abbé Tosini, known as the author of the '*Storia e Sentimento sopra il Giansenismo.*' He laid down as the two fundamental principles of every negotiation these points:—1. The existence of the Chapters; 2. The true Archiepiscopal character of Vosmer and his successors.

Fifteen years had now elapsed since any ordination had been held in the Church of Holland. The elder Priests were dying off; while a stream of young Molinists and Ultramontanes was continually poured in from Brussels and Cologne. If this state of things could not be remedied, the Church of Utrecht was plainly near its end. There could be no doubt that the Chapter had the power of giving letters dimissory to subjects whom it might deem fit for the Priesthood; the only difficulty was, to find a Prelate bold enough to brave the indignation of Rome by ordaining upon them. The Chapter first cast its eyes towards England. It was well known that the Roman Catholics of that kingdom had been kept from the enjoyment of a national Episcopate by the machinations of the Jesuits alone; and it was therefore hoped that they would sympathise with a Church suffering under the same evil, and from the same cause. Giffard, Bishop of Madaura, and Vicar Apostolic, then residing in London, was disposed to act; two of his brethren were not unfavourable to the scheme; it seems to have come to nought by the opposition of the third. The Chapter then thought of the Irish Prelates. They, having maintained a national Church, ought to know its blessings; and in Luke Fagan, Bishop of Meath, they found a prelate who was hardy enough to comply with their request. In four ordinations he ordained twelve priests; this was in the years 1715 and 1716. He, however, required a solemn promise from each of the candidates that they would never reveal the circumstances of their ordination during his life. A curious event occurred some years afterwards. The secret was not so well kept as to prevent an indistinct rumour from reaching the Court of Rome that some Irish Bishop had ordained Priests for Utrecht. Fagan, by this time Archbishop of Dublin, received orders to discover which Prelate had done so. He convoked the Irish Bishops; put the question to each of them individually; and returned for answer that, after examination, he was persuaded that none of the Bishops, of whom he had inquired, had held any such ordination.

When it was known that twelve priests had been ordained for the Church of Utrecht, the Internuncio was furious. The snare he had woven with so much care was broken. Who could

have had the effrontery to disregard the Papal will? At last the bright idea struck him that these orders must have been conferred by some Greek Bishop. When disabused of this notion, he believed, or at least professed to believe, that the twelve Priests had never been ordained at all.

This infusion of new blood raised the courage of the heroic Chapter. It is wonderful, and may not be without its lesson to us, what nine simple Priests, without wealth, influence, or position, with nothing but the right on their side, could do against all the intrigues of the Company, and the fulminations of the Court of Rome. They now determined to try what assistance they could obtain from France. The Bull '*Unigenitus*' was exciting the deepest indignation in that kingdom; the residence of Quesnel, Petitpied, and other distinguished writers of that party in Holland, served as a link between the two countries. A 'consultation' of Van Espen in favour of the rights of the Chapter was adopted by 102 Doctors of the Faculty of Theology at Paris; and then three Bishops signified their willingness to ordain on its letters dimissory, the See vacant. These were: Soanen of Senes, whose subsequent deposition by the Council of Embrun we have already noticed, Lorraine of Bayeux, and Caumartin of Blois.

In 1719 a prelate¹ appears on the stage, who was destined to exercise the most material influence on the fortunes of the Church of Utrecht. This was Dominique Marie Varlet. A devoted missionary in Louisiana, he had been called from that country to labour in the East. Consecrated at Paris, under the title of Bishop of Babylon, he was obliged, on account of the war then raging, to make the overland journey through Russia. On his way to S. Petersburg, he took up his residence at Amsterdam. The Chapter of Utrecht earnestly besought him to confirm the members of the National Church. For twenty years no Confirmation had been held, and there seemed no hope of one except from him. He hesitated for some time, but at last consented to confirm the poorer members of the Church, leaving those who were able to visit other dioceses to receive Confirmation there. It was not to be supposed that the Jesuits would forgive this deed; and, accordingly, the Bishop of Babylon received, as soon as he arrived at Schamake, on the Caspian Sea, a sentence of suspension from the Bishop of Ispahan. The act of suspension, besides its injustice, was so notoriously informal, that, in Van Espen's judgment, it was absolutely good for nothing. However, Varlet returned to Paris,

¹ The best account of this Prelate is to be found in the *Apologie de M. l'Evêque de Babylone*. Amsterdam, 1724. It is a quarto of more than 700 pages, and was much valued by Van Espen.

and for some time prosecuted his Appeal, by means of an agent at Rome. At length, finding that the affair was hopeless, he came to Amsterdam, and appealed both from the sentence of suspension, and from the Bull *Unigenitus*, to the Future Council. The Act is of February 15, 1723; and, in the following May, the Chapter of Utrecht, now for twenty years deprived of its Bishop, followed his example, and appealed, in defence of its rights, to the next Free and Œcumenical Council. The Act was sent to the University of Paris, and to the appellants Bishops, whom we have already mentioned. From most of these the Church of Utrecht received congratulations and good wishes.

The rupture being now complete, the Chapter resolved to use every means for the procuring an Archbishop. The difficulty, of course, lay in the practice that had by degrees been introduced, of requiring a Papal Bull as necessary to the consecration of a Prelate. But all the best Canonists and Theologians regarded the innovation as a mere ecclesiastical arrangement, which might be proper in ordinary circumstances, but could not be turned into an instrument of the destruction of a great National Church. Thus argued the Portuguese theologians when, on the accession of the House of Bragança, from the fear of displeasing Spain, Rome for *twenty-five* years refused Bulls; thus argued the assemblies of the French Clergy, in 1650 and 1682; thus, in 1718, with regard to the Bishops nominated during the minority of Louis XV., and who had not accepted the *Unigenitus*. In all these cases the Court of Rome only avoided the danger by conceding what was demanded; but the Church of Holland, being weak, comparatively small, incapable of enriching the Papal treasury, and under a secular government which would not interfere in its behalf, might of course be insulted with impunity.

The first proceeding of the Chapter was to obtain the sentiments of the principal Catholic Universities on a 'Consultation' of Van Espen's, in favour of the project. Nineteen Doctors of the Sorbonne, with the consent of a great number of their brethren, approved of it; the University of Nantes would have given in its public adherence, had not the tyrannical Council of Conscience interfered; several Doctors of Rheims urged forward the business; the great authorities of Louvain had already spoken; Serry, Theological Professor at Padua, was in the same sentiments; and many doctors and dignitaries besought the Chapter to act on its undoubted right.

So urged, it next sounded the Government authorities as to their sentiments; for it must be remembered that no Archbishop of Utrecht had as yet been consecrated, under that title, since the

Reformation. The dispositions of the magistrates were favourable; a Protestant lawyer, Slicher, even published a pamphlet to show that the subjection of its Roman Catholic citizens to a National Episcopate would be advantageous to the State. Then at length the Metropolitan Chapter proceeded to election; and, on the 27th of April, 1723, Cornelius Steenhoven was chosen Archbishop of Utrecht. The Chapter wrote, the same day, to the Pope, requesting his confirmation of the Bishop elect, and his dispensation from the necessity of two assistant Bishops. Three such missives, however, produced no answer; and the Chapter then made known its cause to the whole Church. Cardinal De Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, openly approved the justice of that cause, but was too timid to exert himself on its behalf.

On the death of Innocent XIII., whose silence had by some been construed into a half approval of the measures of the Chapter, the Cardinals, afraid that the vacancy of the Holy See would give fresh courage to those whom they denounced as rebels, addressed a letter to Spinelli, Internuncio at Brussels, in which the Church of Holland, and the Bishop of Babylon, were stigmatised with the most opprobrious language. This could not, however, damp the courage of the Chapter nor of the exiled Bishop; and, on the 15th of October, 1724, Cornelius Steenhoven was consecrated at the Hague, by that Prelate. He immediately gave notice of the event to the new Pope, Benedict XIII., and quietly awaited the issue. Letters of congratulation flowed in on him. Among the French Bishops who directly or indirectly addressed him, were those of Senez, Auxerre, Montpellier, Bayeux, Mâcon, Pamiers, Rhôdez, Bayonne, Castres, Dax, Tarbes, and Lombez. The Pope, by a Brief of February 21, 1725, declared the election null, and the consecration illicit and execrable; and warned the faithful of Holland against all communion with the pretended Archbishop. One Damen, a Doctor of Louvain, improved on this, by undertaking to show that the consecration of Steenhoven was absolutely null and void, as performed by one prelate, without dispensation. Van Espen's opinion was requested; and, in a well-considered 'Consultation,' he showed the unheard-of absurdity of such a pretence. It was, however, an unhappy publication for the great Canonist. The editor who published the opinion added a short preface, in which he undertook to prove the consecration licit, as well as valid. Damen denounced this preface, which he chose to attribute to Van Espen, as in direct contravention to the Papal Brief. The affair was taken up by the secular powers; and, after the intrigues of two years, Van Espen was condemned, and obliged to take

refuge at Maestricht. The rights of the Church of Utrecht were ably defended by Canons Van Erkel and Broedersen, as well as by the Bishop of Babylon himself. At the time that the Brief of Excommunication reached Holland, Steenhoven was on his death-bed. He rallied his remaining strength, protested against the sentence as null, again appealed to the Future Council, and departed this life in peace, April 3, 1725.

The terror, as well as indignation, felt by the Papal Court may be judged by the extraordinary means taken to crush the Church of Utrecht. All Catholic princes were requested to use their influence at the Hague, for the banishment of those who supported it. Even the Republic of Venice wrote on the subject; and the States, in civil terms, bade it mind its own business. The Chapter proceeded to an election, and the choice fell on John Cornelius Barchman Wuytiers, already Vicar-General, the See vacant. Rome now offered the States to allow a Bishop of Haarlem, if they would forbid the consecration of Barchman: but this mean and pitiful concession was made in vain. Other means were therefore to be tried. The Bishop of Babylon was now on a visit at the Helder. A lady, warmly attached to the Ultramontane party, was heard to boast that he would not long trouble the country. A few days subsequently, that Prelate received a pressing invitation from the captain of a strange vessel, perfectly unknown to him, to honour him by dining on board. He politely refused, and the ship instantly left the harbour. Had he accepted the invitation, there can be no doubt that he would have been carried off. Offers were then made of a reconciliation to Rome, if the consecration were deferred; but, after the loss of some time, it was seen that all these pretences were hollow. Barchman was consecrated on the 30th of September, 1725.

On this occasion, Benedict XIII. gave a curious proof of his infallibility as to facts. In the Brief which declared the election of Barchman illicit, allusion was made to the death of Archbishop Steenhoven, as a visible mark of the Divine vengeance. 'So also was that of the layman Donker,' proceeded the Brief, 'a great supporter of that party, who died in impenitence and damnable disobedience.' On the Sunday after receiving this instrument, M. Donker, who was a highly respectable parish priest in Amsterdam, and in perfect health, publicly read this Brief from his pulpit; and we may conceive him then to have addressed his audience on the reasonableness of the formula, and of the *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*. The people who drew up the next Brief against Archbishop Barchman's consecration learnt caution, and named no one but the prelate, whose name, however, they were still so unlucky as to spell wrong. He replied by an appeal to the Future Council; and, at the same

time, announced his willingness to resign on these conditions: no Formulary; no *Unigenitus*; the rights of the Chapter recognised.

He was much occupied in giving the Seminary at Amersfoort, already established for the clergy of the National Church, the form which it at present retains; and here Van Espen, in the eighty-third year of his age, found a refuge during the last months of his life. Here, on the 2d of October, 1728, he went to appeal to a more righteous Judge, against the iniquitous sentence which had driven him from home, to die in the arms of that Church whose defence he had so generously undertaken. His obsequies were performed by the Archbishop himself.

A miracle which was attributed to Barchman, made almost the same sensation at Amsterdam that the cure of Mademoiselle Perrier had done in Paris. A girl, by name Agatha Leenderts Stouthandel, who had suffered for six years from a dropsy, pronounced by the physicians incurable, conceived the idea that, if she could communicate at the hand of the Archbishop, she should be made whole. She did so on the Epiphany of 1726, and was instantly and perfectly cured. This miracle was attested by three physicians, 130 Catholics, and 30 Protestants; all of whom had been acquainted with the subject on whom it was wrought.

We could, with pleasure, dwell on the Episcopate of Archbishop Barchman—on the Mission which he originated in Russia, in the hope of bringing about a reconciliation between the two Churches; and that which he proposed in the East Indies. But space compels us to pass over these; and we will only add that he terminated a religious life, May 13, 1733.

Nor must we allow ourselves to dwell on his six successors in the See of Utrecht. Their names will be found in a note.¹ We shall only make one or two observations on their history.

It pleased God to spare the Bishop of Babylon till the persecuted Church had been confirmed and consolidated. On his

¹ The succession of prelates in the Church of Holland since its separation, will stand thus:—

1. UTRECHT.

		Consecrated.	Died.	By whom Consecrated.
LXVII.	Archbp. Cornelius Steenhoven....	Oct. 15, 1724.	April 3, 1725.	{Dominic Varlet, Bishop of Babylon.
LXVIII.	— J. C. Barchman Wuy- tiers.....	Sept. 30, 1725.	May 13, 1733.	{Dominic Varlet, Bishop of Babylon.
LXIX.	— Theodore Van der Croon.	Oct. 28, 1734.	June 9, 1739.	{Dominic Varlet, Bishop of Babylon.
LXX.	— Peter John Meindaarts...	Oct. 18, 1739.	Oct. 31, 1767.	{Dominic Varlet, Bishop of Babylon.
LXXI.	— Walter Michael Van Nieuwen Huysen	Feb. 7, 1768.	April 14, 1797.	{Van Stiphout, Bishop of Haarlem.
LXXII.	— ——— Van Rhin.....	July 5, 1797.	June 24, 1808.	{Adrian Brockman, Bishop of Haarlem.
LXXIII.	— Willibrord Van Os	April 24, 1814.	Feb. 28, 1825.	{Gilbert Jong, Bishop of Deventer.
LXXIV.	— {John Van Santen	Nov. 13, 1825.		{John Bon, Bishop of Haarlem.
	— {the present Archbishop}			

decease in 1742, Archbishop Meindaarts, (one of those who had been ordained Priest by the Bishop of Meath,) and the Chapter of Utrecht, determined to fill some of the suffragan sees, in order that the succession might not be irreparably lost. Haarlem was therefore first provided with a Bishop: and sixteen years after, Deventer; and by these prelates the succession has been continued till the present time.

All these Bishops have given notice to the Roman See of their election and consecration, and all but one have been answered with a brief of excommunication, framed on the model of that launched at Barchman. Gilbert Jong, Bishop of Deventer, was the exception, and this, it is said, in deference to the representations of Cardinal Gonsalvi. The brief of excommunication has always been answered by an Act of Appeal. The election of the Archbishop has remained in the Chapter; but the two suffragans are, by right of devolution, absolutely appointed by the Archbishop.

The Council of Utrecht, in 1763, made some sensation throughout Europe; and, by its Acts, which have been published, seems to have been the model of a Provincial Synod.

In the meantime, letters of communion, received from bishops and illustrious ecclesiastics, have been very numerous, and justify the exclamation of Archbishop Van Nieuwen Huysen, 'What sort of schismatics are we, to whom the whole Catholic Church hastens to proffer its communion?' The most celebrated, besides the French bishops whom we have already mentioned, are, Cardinal Marefoschi, Bortoli, titular Archbishop of Nazianzum; Clement, Bishop of Barcelona; Scipio Ricci, of Pistoia; Carsolli, of Aste; Herberstein, of Laybach; Rautenstrauch, of Braun; the University of Sienna; the University of Louvain; the Archbishop of Salzburg, in 1772; and

2. HAARLEM.

			Consecrated.	By whom Consecrated.
III.	Bp. Jerome de Bock.....	Sept. 2, 1742.	{	Meindaarts, Archbp. of Utrecht.
IV.	— — Van Stiphout.....	July 11, 1745.	{	Meindaarts, Archbp. of Utrecht.
V.	— Adrian Broekman.....	—	{	Van Nieuwen Huy- sen, Abp. of Utrecht.
VI.	— Van Nieuwen Huysen ...	1801.	{	Van Rhin, Archbp. of Utrecht.
VII.	— John Bon	1814.	{	Van Os, Archbp. of Utrecht.
VIII.	— { Henry John Van Buul (the present Bishop.) }	May 10, 1843.	{	Van Santen, Archbp. of Utrecht.

3. DEVENTER.

III.	Bp. — Byvelde	Jan. 25, 1758.	{	Meindaarts, Archbp. of Utrecht.
IV.	— — Nellesmann.....		{	Van Nieuwen Huy- sen, Abp. of Utrecht.
V.	— Gilbert Jong	1805.	{	Van Rhin, Archbp. of Utrecht.
VI.	— { William Vet..... (the present Bishop.) }	Oct. 7, 1824.	{	Van Os, Archbp. of Utrecht.

numerous dignitaries in Tuscany, Spain, Portugal, Sardinia, at Pavia, and Vienna. 'We promise to maintain,' say some of these documents, 'that the Church of Utrecht is beyond all suspicion of heresy or schism, and we regard it as truly Roman Catholic.'

We will relate the difficulties which attended the usurpation of Louis Bonaparte in the words of Archbishop Van Santen. It occurred on the death of Archbishop Van Rhin.

' Aussitôt après son inhumation, lorsque le chapitre se disposait à faire l'élection de son successeur, Louis Bonaparte, qui gouvernait alors les Provinces-Unies en qualité de Roi de Hollande, fit écrire par son ministre au chapitre métropolitain, pour qu'il eût à surseoir à l'élection de l'archevêque d'Utrecht, jusqu'à qu'il eût été procédé à l'organisation des cultes dans le royaume de Holland. Le chapitre s'aperçut sans peine que le but où tendait le Roi, était de nommer lui-même, à l'imitation des autres rois Catholiques, aux évêchés de la Hollande. C'est pourquoi il lui adressa une première requête, pour le conjurer de ne point mettre obstacle à l'élection que les Saints Canons imposaient à chacun de ses membres, de faire de leur archevêque. N'ayant pas reçu de réponse, le chapitre lui en adressa une seconde. Mais elle lui fut renvoyée, avec la mention suivante: "Les motifs qui ont engagé le Roi à faire cette défense, subsistent encore.— Par ordre du Roi: R. G. de TUYLL." Cet état de choses a duré jusqu'à ce que l'Empereur Napoléon eût réuni la Hollande à l'empire Français: et quand il vint à Utrecht, le 6 Octobre, 1811, le chapitre lui fit de respectueuses représentations sur la défense qui lui avait été faite, depuis trois ans, de procéder à l'élection de son archevêque: mais il répondit que son intention était de nommer lui-même tous les évêques de la Hollande, comme il le faisait en France: et qu'il s'arrangerait avec le Pape pour parvenir à cette fin.'

The Chapter certainly cannot be acquitted either of Erastianism, or of want of courage, in allowing the See, in deference to an earthly sovereign, to remain vacant six years: for it was not till the fall of Napoleon that Willibrord Van Os was elected Archbishop. On the death of this prelate, his successor, the present Archbishop, and his two suffragans, were officially recognised by the government; and the king had before this interested himself in bringing about a pacification between the National Church and Rome. But the exorbitant demands of the latter, by the legate Nazalli then, and the legate Cappucini afterwards, frustrated the scheme. The favour with which the government regarded the National Church would seem, however, to be diminished, for the last prelate, Van Buul, of Haarlem, was consecrated in opposition to the king and his ministry by the present venerable¹ and excellent Archbishop, in 1843.

We could have wished to proceed to the (so-called) Jansenist

¹ So we learn by a letter from Pastor Van Werckhoven, of S. Gertrude at Utrecht. His words are, *invito rege et ministris*.

movements in Tuscany and Portugal, but we are compelled to defer the task. With one or two observations on the history of Utrecht we will conclude for the present.

The contest in which that Church is engaged is, in some important respects, our own. Under the ban of the Pope, it claims to be attached, as we do, to Catholic Unity;—it appeals, as we do, to the Future Council; it lives, as we do, in hope of the day when the communion with the Church Universal, which it believes itself to hold invisibly, shall be visibly restored. Before that day, it may probably become extinct. It numbers only thirty priests, eighteen students in the seminary at Amersfoort, and about five thousand laity. But numbers are no criterion of justice. Whenever the blessed time shall come that shall see all these jars healed, surely the memory of those great and good men, whether in Utrecht or among us, who have died in the full belief that the Council to which they explicitly or implicitly appealed would do them justice, and in the full determination to submit to the Synod, whatever should be its decree, will then be held in benediction. The little church of Warmond, where many of the Archbishops of Holland rest, will, perhaps, then attract notice from others besides a 'Jansenist,' or a passing English Catholic. In spite of the excommunications thundered against them by Rome, from Benedict XIII. to Gregory XVI., they, dying in the unshaken desire of unity, and in the unshaken profession of the Catholic Faith, and having submitted themselves and their cause to the Head of the Church, and to the Future Council, have, no doubt, their part in the promise: *The souls of the just are in the hand of God, and there shall no harm happen unto them.*

In the meantime it is heartily to be wished that some scheme could be devised by which two Churches, in many respects so similarly situated, could be brought into friendly relations. Undoubtedly, there would be difficulties in the way; but if Dupin on the one side, and Archbishop Wake on the other, entertained hopes of accomplishing the intercommunion of the French and English Churches, when the obstacles were so much greater, why need we despair when the circumstances of the case present some remarkable facilities for a reconciliation? The rejection of Molinism, and the appeal from the *Unigenitus*, ought to smooth matters; and if the attempt were really made, who can say to what blessed effects it might lead? This, at least, the writer of the present article may assure the three Bishops of the Church of Holland, (by whom it will be read,) that many and many a fellow-churchman would heartily rejoice in the day, to be wished for and prayed for, whether granted or not, that might see Utrecht and Canterbury at one.

It is thus that the present Bishops conclude their last Act of Appeal, and with it we end:—

‘For these causes, and for others to be stated at fitting place and time, having in view only the divine will, the well-being and the maintenance of our Churches, and declaring expressly, as solemnly and emphatically as in us lies, that we never intended to undertake, or but to conceive, anything in opposition to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, or to the dignity of the Holy See, to which we shall remain attached to our latest breath; . . . persisting in all the Appeals made, whether by the Archbishops of Utrecht deceased, or by the Chapters of the Metropolitan Church, from the year 1719 till now, and in each of them in particular, renewing them, and considering them as inserted here: We by these presents APPEAL, as far as need is, both from the said Bulls, disseminated under the name of His Holiness Leo XII., of which one is reported¹ to be dated Aug. 25, 1825, and the other Jan. 13, 1826, and from all the like briefs that may be published, and from the penal sentences therein expressed, and from all other accidents which may have resulted, or may hereafter result therefrom, as illegal, unjust, null, and of no value; and further, from all the said injuries, and from each one in particular, already exercised, or hereafter to be exercised against us, to the NEXT ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL, that shall be legally convoked, in a place to which we may freely resort, in person or by deputies, and to him or them that shall rightfully judge in the cause: And we demand, in the most earnest manner, the letters termed *dimissory*,² recommending our persons, our state, and our rights, to the protection of God, the Church Catholic, and the said Œcumenical Council: And we reserve to ourselves the right of renewing this our appeal, when, where, and before whom we shall judge fit.

‘Done at Utrecht, Haarlem, and the Hague, in the month of Feb. 1825.

✕ JOHN, *Archbishop of Utrecht*. [Van Santen.]

✕ JOHN, *Bishop of Haarlem*. [Bon.]

✕ WILLIAM, *Bishop of Deventer*. [Vet.]

¹ Because these Briefs, like their predecessors, were never sent to the persons whom they affected, but were only learnt by them from the newspapers.

² ‘*Ἀπόστολοι, Libelli Dimissorii*, qui a iudice mittuntur à quo appellatum est, appellatione receptâ, ad eum quem reus actorve condemnatus appellavit, quibus totius rei cognitionem in eum transfert.’—*Ducange*, s. v.

ART. VI.—*The Life of John Sterling.* By THOMAS CARLYLE. London: Chapman & Hall. 1851.

THIS book is professedly the biography of a personal friend of Mr. Carlyle's. It is written, we are told, to give the true picture of one, of whom another biographer has given an inadequate and distorted sketch. Archdeacon Hare has published one *Life of Mr. Sterling*, prefixed to a collection of his *Remains*. This gave great dissatisfaction to many religious people, but it gave still greater to Mr. Carlyle. The one were scandalized at Archdeacon Hare's appearing to apologise for Sterling's unbelief; Mr. Carlyle is angry with him for thinking that it needed apology. He quarrels with the Archdeacon's extenuating tone, not for its boldness, but for its cowardice; not as excess of tenderness to the memory of a friend, but as treason to it. Such a life as Sterling's, he thinks, ought not to be left to the representations of one who, however candid and kindly, is still so hampered by professional prejudice as to think it necessary to meet seriously the charge of scepticism. Such a charge, in the popular sense of it, was one to avow and make light of—in a more refined and recondite sense, to make a matter of the highest praise. With these feelings Mr. Carlyle feels himself bound to restore the reputation of his friend.

Such is the professed purpose of the book. But it must be a great subject indeed, which, in Mr. Carlyle's hands, eclipses himself. Hardly did the French Revolution do so. Oliver Cromwell was certainly not great enough. Still less, a clever, brilliant, amiable young *littérateur* of the nineteenth century; one, whose like and whose superior most persons may have seen, whose life has been passed in cultivated society. We do not, in the least, call in question the sincerity of the biographer's friendship and zeal. But it is he, and not Sterling, who fills the page. We do not say that he can help it. Each man has his own way of writing, and Mr. Carlyle has his. But so it is. Mr. Carlyle cannot forget himself, and cannot place himself anywhere but in the foreground. In this book, it is not a picture of Sterling that we have; it is Mr. Carlyle trying to draw his picture, and lecturing us the while.

Of the picture drawing we will speak presently. But the lecturing is, if not the most striking part of the book, the part which at first arrests attention. And to any one who had heard this lecturing for the first time, it would seem very striking and

impressive. His text is the vanity, the confusion, the falsehood, the selfishness which undeniably prevail in human affairs; his tone one of deep and scornful indignation—in its rugged honesty intolerant of all exceptions or disguises, and regardless of all conventional proprieties. This dark side of society is but too real a one; it is familiar to every one, and we are reminded of it by the constant recurrence, in the common language of the day, of a variety of emphatic words, which have sprung from the popular consciousness of it, and whose low-born origin and inelegance is pardoned for their expressiveness. What Englishman is not alive to the prevalence of *humbug* in every department of society? What Englishman but warms at its exposure? To be supposed to possess a strong sense of it, and a power to show it up, is the stock-in-trade of many who lead higher and more cultivated opinion than that of a vestry or town-council. But if you want to hear humbug of all sorts talked against in a new and forcible manner, Mr. Carlyle is the man for you. No Chartist demagogue, with St. Alban's for his theme, no Radical alderman, declaiming about Bishops, no inventive controversialist, adapting the cry of the day to his theological necessities, ever took such a wide range, dashed at his game with such frank vigour, or brought up from all sides such perfect and unexpected adaptations of language, to stamp it with appropriate and memorable symbols of infamy. No one could read Mr. Carlyle for the first time, without feeling that the hollowness of the nineteenth century had found in him the genius which understood and could celebrate it. Great powers of the writer's own were brought to bear—everything was sacrificed to the object of expressing it fully. The licences of familiar gossip, the antique roughness of the ballad, the grotesque vocabulary of the Puritans, and an equally quaint one of Mr. Carlyle's own, made their appearance, strangely enough, yet not out of place, in bursts of high eloquence, or earnest sympathy. Imagination contributed from its stores, in rich profusion and novelty, the monstrous, the loathsome, the ridiculous, and together with them, the grand; while history supplied heroic contrasts of the most varied forms to modern littleness. But unprecedented as the mixture was, it became in Mr. Carlyle's hands a homogeneous and living style, springing fresh from a vigorous mind, invented for the purpose of pouring contempt on 'shams,' and of great capabilities for its end.

This lecturing is, as we have said, at first hearing, very impressive and startling; and it has impressed and startled people. Mr. Carlyle has been listened to with a mixture of feelings, but with profound attention; with plenty of remarks on his uncouth language, and strange ideas, and want of taste,—with protests that

'people could not understand him, could not make out what he 'was driving at,' but with abundant proofs of interest. Mr. Carlyle ranks among those who are looked upon as the teachers of their generation. He cannot complain of want of a hearing: it is rather for us to consider what he has told us, or taught us.

He has certainly impressed upon us, with his sledge-hammer strokes, that the world in our own day, and our own country, is very far from answering really, in any of its aspects, to those wholesale self-gratulatory and self-adulatory representations of it and its improvement, which used to be in fashion some years ago, but would now be considered rather shallow and behind the time. He has contributed powerfully, along with other influences, and the course of events, to disturb our ideas about the unrivalled solidity and excellence of our social and political state. He has sent a rude shock, not before it was time, against much smug, sleek, sleepy self-complacency; he has pitilessly given a bad name to the mere conventionalities of morals. He has made us feel, that in the midst of our knowledge, our success, and our pride, we are still walking in the twilight and among snares, with the gulfs of the pit under our feet; and he has made us feel also, that except in the noble and unselfish virtues of manhood, there is no charm against our perils—that nothing that is unreal will stand the proof. To whatever extent these salutary, if not very comfortable truths, are more recognised than they were—to whatever extent they have imposed a more subdued and measured tone on our ordinary way of speaking of our prosperity—abated arrogance, and added thoughtfulness to just enthusiasm—much of the effect is undoubtedly due, directly or indirectly, to Mr. Carlyle.

So much is to be acknowledged, and with it, it seems, we must be content. Perhaps it is asking more than is fair under the circumstances, to ask Mr. Carlyle to lay his hand on any one practical recommendation, in the course of all his volumes, as to how the evils which he so definitely specifies, are definitely to be dealt with. He would tell us, probably, that he did not profess to construct or mend, only to expose those who pretend to do so. But so the fact is. There are a number of people in the world who are very active, in their several ways—with definite practical methods for what they think the improvement and good of their fellow-men—in many cases for their own good also, but along with that of others. They work early and late, with resolution, with thoughtfulness, with self-devotion, with toil and pain, often, as *they* think, with success. Not so Mr. Carlyle. He, sitting in his study at Chelsea, and looking out on them all, pronounces them in the gross, a set of sharpeners or blockheads, losing their time. They really do work

hard—head and hand are busy all day, heavy and worn with work at night. Mr. Carlyle, with his paper before him, sneeringly damns them all, and writes them down impostors, blindly scrambling and struggling in inextricable mazes of selfishness and corruption; manufacturers and country gentlemen, trades and professions, lawyers, physicians, clergymen, prime ministers, all but, perhaps, the labourer and handicraftsman, and the literary man.

'Surely as mad a world as you could wish!

'If you want to make sudden fortunes in it, and achieve the temporary hallelujah of flunkeys for yourself, renounce the perennial esteem of wise men; if you can believe that the chief end of man is to collect about him a bigger heap of gold than ever before, in a shorter time than ever before, you will find it a most handy and every way furthersome, blessed and felicitous world. But for any other human aim, I think you will find it not furthersome. If you in any way ask practically, How a noble life is to be led in it? you will be luckier than Sterling or I if you get any credible answer, or find any made road whatever. Alas, it is even so.

'Heaven mend it! In a better time there will be other "professions" than those three extremely cramp, confused and indeed almost obsolete ones: professions, if possible that are true, and do not require you at the threshold to constitute yourself an impostor. Human association,—which will mean discipline, vigorous wise subordination and co-ordination,—is so unspeakably important. Professions, "regimented human pursuits," how many of honourable and manful might be possible for men; and which should not, in their results to society, need to stumble along, in such an unwieldy futile manner, with legs swollen into such enormous elephantiasis and no go at all in them! Men will one day think of the force they squander in every generation, and the fatal damage they encounter, by this neglect.'—Pp. 51—53.

He calls for work, but the work which has hitherto 'maintained the state of the world' he will not have, nor will he tell us what he wants instead. He calls for 'intelligible speech,' but not the speech which is accounted intelligible by the mass of men, and of his own he will give us none. He thunders against flunkeyism; he flames into enthusiasm for the heroic, and the man-like. What shall we do to be heroic and man-like in our day and generation? Mr. Carlyle, in answer, tells us in racy and often eloquent paragraphs, *to be so*.—He has told us much that is false—we cannot remember that he has given us the hope of finding, in one single case, what is true.

Mr. Carlyle, it appears, steadily declines committing himself to anything that may be tried. The utmost he will do, is to point to, and comment on, certain select heroes of the past, of great variety, and many degrees of excellence. From these, or his sketches of them,—Mahomet, Dante, Luther, Cromwell, Mirabeau, Dr. Johnson, and the famous Abbot Sampson, of Bury St. Edmund's,—we are to learn what Mr. Carlyle thinks we ought to be. But anything more definite he refuses. We

are to work; but if we go on working in our old lines, as lawyers or clergymen, we are carrying on an imposture. We are to believe; but if we believe what men and Christians have believed before us, we believe 'shams.' Mr. Carlyle is an impressive teacher, but he is a very puzzling one.

But much more damaging than even this to Mr. Carlyle's usefulness and character, is—it is a strange charge to make against one whose watchwords are fact and veracity—his want of truthfulness,—truthfulness of feeling, truthfulness of statement. A man may tell us a great many truths, such as no one else tells us, without being himself truthful; and a writer whose chosen instrument is exaggeration, plain, palpable, undeniable exaggeration, exaggeration repeated continually, written down in cold blood, is not a truthful writer. We pardon the exaggeration of passion; but when it has become a habit and a trick, it is no more pardonable in a moralist, using it to give effect to his philosophy, than it is in the fanatic or demagogue. The man who uses it consciously, the man who does not check himself in it when he may, does what lies in him to dull and destroy the sense of truth, in himself, and those whom he speaks to. Most readers will be struck, some impressed, others perhaps delighted, and many amused, with the following picture of our own day,—but who seriously believes it?

'So dark and abstruse, without lamp or authentic finger-post, is the course of pious genius towards the Eternal Kingdoms grown. No fixed highway more; the old spiritual highways and recognised paths to the Eternal, now all torn up and flung in heaps, submerged in unutterable boiling mud-oceans of Hypocrisy and Unbelievability, of brutal living Atheism and damnable dead putrescent Cant: surely a tragic pilgrimage for all mortals; Darkness, and the mere shadow of Death, enveloping all things from pole to pole; and in the raging gulf-currents, offering us will-o'-wispes for loadstars,—intimating that there are no stars, nor ever were, except certain Old-Jew ones which have now gone out. Once more, a tragic pilgrimage for all mortals; and for the young pious soul, winged with genius, and passionately seeking land, and passionately abhorrent of floating carrion withal, more tragical than for any!'—Pp. 126, 127.

To have written this once, is to have written it once too often, for the simple reason, that even the writer does not believe it. With a world so mad, so lost, really *believed* and *felt* to be so mad and lost, no sane man could be living in easy converse, quietly enjoying its conveniences, receiving its money, sympathy, patronage, and applause, in exchange for his eloquent books. He would be more embruted than the mad world itself, if he had the heart for such employments and such a commerce. But Mr. Carlyle is not to be taken strictly at his word here; he has a strong impression, and by some powerful means he wishes to communicate it. What such a picture answers to, is the feeling of an irritated and indignant mind—not the real intellectual conviction

of even this mind; for he knows well what abatements have to be made, what compensations have to be taken into account, to reduce such a view into an agreement with the truths which he acts upon every day. But if he has said this once, he has said it fifty times. And he thinks by such lessons to school men into veracity in word and act and feeling, into being true-hearted and real! Even set all this down as bursts of passionate sorrow, is it becoming, or is it wise, to be indulging and exhibiting it, time after time, to write it, print it, and correct it in the proof sheets, for the benefit of what is, on the whole, after all, but a literary public?

If Mr. Carlyle, then, has taught forcibly and well some great general truths, he has gone a great way to undo his own work, as far as it is of value, by the vague and untruthful feelings with which he teaches men to regard them. His savage and querulous isolation does not recommend—and each man's own neighbourhood, his circle of work, his friendships, the truths on which he lives and leans, his affections, his hopes, contradict in detail more or less—a philosophy which excludes all light and wisdom and mutual trust from the world. It has been implied in what has been said, and it is now to be stated distinctly, that it excludes also, and in this volume, with every indication of impatient contempt, all that has been hitherto accounted religious faith. Religious faith, he thinks, there was once—deceived, indeed, in its imagination of a direct Gospel from heaven, but growing out of the ancient piety and nobleness of man's nature: there is none now; there is but the false imagination without the living belief; and that men should profess more seems almost to goad him into rage. What his own belief is, it is impossible to say. All that appears is, that he acknowledges a Supreme Power above him, and holds that the essential form of religion is devout submission to the will of this Power; though how that submission is to be exhibited, what makes the difference between a 'true son,' and a 'miserable mutinous rebel,' repining, complaining, blaspheming, it would have been well, as it is of high consequence, for him to have made more clear. A mythology he may be said to have—expressed by the plurals of abstract ideas. He brings in agencies beyond the visible world, awful to confront, before whom all men will do well to bow, if not to adore—the 'Silences,' and the 'Destinies,' and the 'Immensities,' and the 'Terrors,' and the 'Eternities,' and the 'Powers,' and the 'Harmonious Wisdoms,' who, besides the Highest Eternal Power, guide and punish man. Not a new mythology either. In ancient times, the same train and cast of thought—taking, as was natural, a more concrete and less shadowy form, among men who struggled with the same problems as Mr. Carlyle, in the same spirit, and,

perhaps, with not less earnestness, and for their day not less originality—issued in that *Genealogy of the 'Ages,'* hovering between the personal, the symbolical, and the abstract—not idols, not attributes—grotesque enough now that the names are strange, and the key lost, but, doubtless, as significant and mysteriously impressive once to the subtle and solemn Gnostics, as Mr. Carlyle's words are to his admirers—the 'Depth,' 'in high places invisible and unnameable, in calm and stillness manifold,'—and with him 'Thought,' the same as 'Grace' and 'Silence,' from whence came the Divine pairs, 'First-born Mind,' and 'Truth,' 'Word' and 'Life,' and all that strange family of personified adjectives, the denizens of the 'spiritual fulness,' who are so carefully drawn out in the catalogues of Irenæus. We only look at them as names; but they were living once, and we are told, great and wonderful mysteries, in which those who will be patient may still find traces of profound ideas.

How he is disposed to treat such matters, may be judged of from the temper which led him, we do not say, in the first instance, to make, but to judge worthy of preservation, worthy to be told, to illustrate himself and his friend, the following piece of common-place vulgar coarseness:—

'In our many promenades and colloquies, which were of the freest, most copious and pleasant nature, religion often formed a topic, and perhaps towards the beginning of our intercourse was the prevailing topic. Sterling seemed much engrossed in matters theological, and led the conversation towards such; talked often about Church, Christianity Anglican and other, how essential the belief in it to man; then, on the other side, about Pantheism and such like:—all in the Coleridge dialect, and with eloquence and volubility to all lengths. I remember his insisting often and with emphasis on what he called a "personal God," and other high topics, of which it was not always pleasant to give account in the argumentative form, in a loud hurried voice, walking and arguing through the fields or streets. Though of warm quick feelings, very positive in his opinions, and vehemently eager to convince and conquer in such discussions, I seldom or never saw the least anger in him against me or any friend. When the blows of contradiction came too thick, he could with consummate dexterity whisk aside out of their way; prick into his adversary on some new quarter; or gracefully flourishing his weapon, end the duel in some handsome manner. One angry glance I remember in him, and it was but a glance, and gone in a moment. "Flat Pantheism!" urged he once (which he would often enough do about this time,) as if triumphantly, of something or other, in the fire of a debate, in my hearing: "It is mere Pantheism, that!"—"And suppose it were Pot-theism?" cried the other: "If the thing is true!"—Sterling did look hurt at such flippant heterodoxy, for a moment. The soul of his own creed, in those days, was far other than this indifference to Pot or Pan in such departments of inquiry.'—Pp. 162, 163.

Such is the tone and drift of Mr. Carlyle's lecturing. With amusing honesty or indifference, he gives us a letter of Sterling's to himself, in which some of its most striking features are hit off

with an unceremonious good-nature, which does not mince its words. Mr. Carlyle 'was very much entertained' by it, and suggests the contrast between himself, the grim rugged puzzler over the mysteries of human life, with his half-made book, 'hanging desolately under bibliopolic difficulties,'—'the poor German Wood-Ox bemired in the forest,'—and his impetuous, clear-minded friend, who thought that he saw to the bottom of it all, and could help the 'Wood-Ox' out of the mire, who was by no means of the same opinion.

'Arrived at Herstmonceux, he had not forgotten us. One of his letters written there soon after was the following, which much entertained me, in various ways. It turns on a poor book of mine, called *Sartor Resartus*; which was not then even a book, but was still hanging desolately under bibliopolic difficulties, now in its fourth or fifth year, on the wrong side of the river, as a mere aggregate of Magazine articles; having at last been slit into that form, and lately completed *so*, and put together into legibility. I suppose Sterling had borrowed it of me. The adventurous hunter spirit which had started such a bemired *Auerocks*, or Urus of the German woods, and decided on chasing that as game, struck me not a little;—and the poor Wood-Ox, so bemired in the forests, took it as a compliment rather.'—Pp. 142, 143.

After commenting, with a mixture of respect and freedom, on the obvious features of Mr. Carlyle's manner—features which have now become notorious—he proceeds:

"All this, of course, appears to me true and relevant; but I cannot help feeling that it is, after all, but a poor piece of quackery to comment on a multitude of phenomena without adverting to the principle which lies at the root, and gives the true meaning to them all. Now this principle I seem to myself to find in the state of mind which is attributed to Teufelsdröckh; in his state of mind, I say, not in his opinions, though these are, in him as in all men, most important,—being one of the best indices to his state of mind. Now what distinguishes him, not merely from the greatest and best men who have been on earth for eighteen hundred years, but from the whole body of those who have been working forwards towards the good, and have been the salt and light of the world, is this: That he does not believe in a God. Do not be indignant, I am blaming no one;—but if I write my thoughts, I must write them honestly.

"Teufelsdröckh does not belong to the herd of sensual and thoughtless men; because he does perceive in all existence a unity of power; because he does believe that this is a real power external to him and dominant to a certain extent over him, and does not think that he is himself a shadow in a world of shadows. He has a deep feeling of the beautiful, the good and the true; and a faith in their final victory.

"At the same time, how evident is the strong inward unrest, the Titanic heaving of mountain on mountain; the storm-like rushing over land and sea in search of peace. He writhes and roars under his consciousness of the difference in himself between the possible and the actual, the hoped-for and the existent. He feels that duty is the highest law of his own being; and knowing how it bids the waves be stilled into an icy fixedness and grandeur, he trusts (but with a boundless inward misgiving) that there is a principle of order which will reduce all confusion to shape and clearness. But wanting peace himself, his fierce dissatisfaction fixes on all that is weak, corrupt and imperfect around him; and instead of a calm and steady co-operation with all those who are endeavouring to apply the highest ideas

as remedies for the worst evils, he holds himself aloof in savage isolation; and cherishes (though he dare not own) a stern joy at the prospect of that Catastrophe which is to turn loose again the elements of man's social life, and give for a time the victory to evil;—in hopes that each new convulsion of the world must bring us nearer to the ultimate restoration of all things; fancying that each may be the last. Wanting the calm and cheerful reliance, which would be the spring of active exertion, he flatters his own distemper by persuading himself that his own age and generation are peculiarly feeble and decayed; and would even perhaps be willing to exchange the restless immaturity of our self-consciousness, and the promise of its long three-pangs, for the unawakened undoubting simplicity of the world's childhood; of the times in which there was all the evil and horror of our day, only with the difference that conscience had not arisen to try and condemn it. In these longings, if they are Teufelsdröckh's, he seems to forget that, could we go back five thousand years, we should only have the prospect of travelling them again, and arriving at last at the same point at which we stand now.

"Something of this state of mind I may say that I understand; for I have myself experienced it. And the root of the matter appears to me: *A want of sympathy with the great body of those who are now endeavouring to guide and help onward their fellow-men.* And in what is this alienation grounded? It is, as I believe, simply in the difference on that point; viz. the clear, deep, habitual recognition of a one Living *Personal God*, essentially good, wise, true and holy, the Author of all that exists; and a reunion with whom is the only end of all rational beings. This belief * * *," [*There follow now several pages on "Personal God," and other abstruse or indeed properly unspeakable matters; these, and a general Postscript of qualifying purport I will suppress; extracting only the following fractions, as luminous or slightly significant to us.*—Pp. 150—152.

—'Several pages on "*Personal God*"—how much can be expressed by the omission of an article!

But it is time to come to the story itself of this, Mr. Carlyle's latest book.

The interest of it is, as we have said, in his way of telling it. About Sterling himself there was even less of interest than might be found in many other clever and amiable men of whom the world hears nothing; and the most remarkable facts about him are, first, that his life should have been written twice, by such men as Archdeacon Hare and Mr. Carlyle, and should be a matter of controversy between them; and, next, that he whose practical work in life was absolutely nothing, who, first from want of purpose, and then from circumstances, did scarcely anything but talk, speculate, argue, write tales, poetry, and articles, all his life long, should be held up by Mr. Carlyle as a model of earnest and faithful striving, and, in good measure, of victorious achievement, in opposition to the dreams and self-delusions of an age destitute of truth and energy.

'And so, having on my hands some leisure at this time, and being bound to it by evident considerations, one of which ought to be especially sacred to me, I decide to fling down on paper some outline of what my recollections and reflections contain in reference to this most friendly, bright and beautiful human soul; who walked with me for a season in this world, and

remains to me very memorable while I continue in it. Gradually, if facts simple enough in themselves can be narrated as they came to pass, it will be seen what kind of man this was; to what extent condemnable for imaginary heresy and other crimes, to what extent laudable and loveable for noble manful *orthodoxy* and other virtues;—and whether the lesson his life had to teach us is not much the reverse of what the religious newspapers hitherto educe from it.

‘Certainly it was not as a “sceptic” that you could define him, whatever his definition might be. . . .

‘True, he had his “religion” to seek, and painfully shape together for himself, out of the abysses of conflicting disbelief and sham belief and bedlam delusion, now filling the world, as all men of reflection have; and in this respect too,—more especially as his lot in the battle appointed for us all was, if you can understand it, victory and not defeat,—he is an expressive emblem of his time, and an instruction and possession to his contemporaries. For, I say, it is by no means as a vanquished *doubter* that he figures in the memory of those who knew him; but rather as a victorious *believer*, and under great difficulties a victorious doer. An example to us all, not of lamed misery, helpless spiritual bewilderment and sprawling despair, or any kind of *drownage* in the foul welter of our so-called religious or other controversies and confusions; but of a swift and valiant vanquisher of all these; a noble assertor of himself, as worker and speaker, in spite of all these. Continually, so far as he went, he was a teacher, by act and word, of hope, clearness, activity, veracity, and human courage and nobleness: the preacher of a good gospel to all men, not of a bad to any man.’—Pp. 8—10.

‘Poor Sterling! he was by nature appointed for a Poet, then,—a Poet after his sort, or recogniser and delineator of the Beautiful; and not for a Priest at all? Striving towards the sunny heights, out of such a level and through such an element as ours in these days is, he had strange aberrations appointed him, and painful wanderings amid the miserable gas-lights, bog-fires, dancing meteors and putrid phosphorescences which form the guidance of a young human soul at present! Not till after trying all manner of sublimely illuminated places, and finding that the basis of them was putridity, artificial gas and quaking bog, did he, when his strength was all done, discover his true sacred hill, and passionately climb thither while life was fast ebbing!—A tragic history, as all histories are; yet a gallant, brave and noble one, as not many are. It is what, to a radiant son of the Muses, and bright messenger of the harmonious Wisdoms, this poor world,—if he himself have not strength enough, and *inertia* enough, and amid his harmonious eloquences silence enough,—has provided at present. Many a high-striving, too-hasty soul, seeking guidance towards eternal excellence from the official Blackartists, and successful Professors of political, ecclesiastical, philosophical, commercial, general and particular Legerdemain, will recognise his own history in this image of a fellow pilgrim’s.’—P. 341.

‘A man of infinite susceptibility; who caught everywhere, more than others, the colour of the element he lived in, the infection of all that was or appeared honourable, beautiful and manful in the tendencies of his time;—whose history therefore is, beyond others, emblematic of that of his time.

‘In Sterling’s writings and actions, were they capable of being well read, we consider that there is for all true hearts, and especially for young noble seekers, and strivers towards what is highest, a mirror in which some shadow of themselves and of their immeasurably complex arena will profitably present itself.’—P. 343.

Mr. Carlyle has full right to paint his friend in as bright

colours as his love and his memory supply; but when such a moral as this is the upshot of that philosophy of earnestness and work, which brands all thought and activity around it as aimless and lying emptiness, when the literary man turns out to be the pattern-worker, the 'victorious doer,' of the age, we must ask leave to review and correct the notions which we have hitherto attached to Mr. Carlyle's expressions about earnestness and work. Literature doubtless has its trials and its sorrows; but if that be the highest toil and labour of man, his lot is an easier one than we fancied it.

Mr. Carlyle does injustice to his subject by exaggerating it. Sterling was not a hero, and all Mr. Carlyle's saying so will not make him out one. But he was a man, and a friend; and there are perhaps few men whose character and story have not enough in them to be capable of being strikingly brought out and well told, by a truthful and sympathising biographer. There is not much to say about Sterling; but a friend who could bring him before us, as an individual and living man, his ways and his talk, the accidents and scenes of an intimate companionship, would not want even so much to make many readers wish to hear about him: and Mr. Carlyle's reminiscences are characteristic and vivid.

Sterling passed part of his boyhood in Wales, and this gives occasion to a description of the scene—the Vale of Glamorgan. The sleepy, green seclusion of the rich, waving, still plain, is well conveyed to the imagination:—

'Plain of Glamorgan, some ten miles wide and thirty or forty long, which they call the Vale of Glamorgan;—though properly it is not quite a Vale, there being only one range of mountains to it, if even one. . . . On such wide terms is it called Vale of Glamorgan. But called by whatever name, it is a most pleasant fruitful region; kind to the native, interesting to the visitor. A waving grassy region; cut with innumerable ragged lanes; dotted with sleepy unswept human hamlets, old ruinous castles with their ivy and their daws, grey sleepy churches with their ditto ditto: for ivy everywhere abounds; and generally a rank fragrant vegetation clothes all things; hanging, in rude many-coloured festoons and fringed odoriferous tapestries, on your right and on your left, in every lane. A country kinder to the sluggard husbandman than any I have ever seen. For it lies all on limestone, needs no draining; the soil, everywhere of handsome depth and finest quality, will grow good crops for you with the most imperfect tilling. At a safe distance of a day's riding lie the tartarean copperforges of Swansea, the tartarean ironforges of Merthyr; their sooty battle far away, and not, at such safe distance, a defilement to the face of the earth and sky, but rather an encouragement to the earth at least; encouraging the husbandman to plough better, if he only would.

The peasantry seem indolent and stagnant, but peaceable and well-provided; much given to Methodism when they have any character;—for the rest an innocent good-humoured people, who all drink home-brewed beer, and have brown loaves of the most excellent home-baked bread. The native peasant village is not generally beautiful, though it might be, were

it swept and trimmed; it gives one rather the idea of sluttish stagnancy,—an interesting peep into the Welsh Paradise of Sleepy Hollow. Stones, old kettles, naves of wheels, all kinds of broken litter, with live pigs and etceteras, lie about the street: for as a rule no rubbish is removed, but waits patiently the action of mere natural chemistry and accident; if even a house is burnt or falls, you will find it there after half a century, only cloaked by the ever-ready ivy. Sluggish man seems never to have struck a pick into it; his new hut is built close by on ground not encumbered, and the old stones are still left lying.

'This is the ordinary Welsh village; but there are exceptions, where people of more cultivated tastes have been led to settle; and Llanblethian is one of the more signal of these. A decidedly cheerful group of human homes, the greater part of them indeed belonging to persons of refined habits; trimness, shady shelter, whitewash, neither conveniency nor decoration has been neglected here. Its effect from the distance on the eastward is very pretty: you see it like a little sleeping cataract of white houses, with trees overshadowing and fringing it; and there the cataract hangs, and does not rush away from you.'—Pp. 22—24.

Sterling's father was the Captain Sterling, who was famous as the 'Thunderer' of the *Times*. With this once mysterious and formidable personage Mr. Carlyle makes very free, and shows us how a 'Thunderer' begins, and what he is in private life. Capt. Sterling was, according to Mr. Carlyle, a man of restless and active mind, who tried many things before he discovered a sufficient outlet for his energy. After soldiering, marrying, farming, he became adjutant of Glamorganshire militia, and, further, took to writing. Mr. Carlyle shall proceed:—

'He had also begun to try writing, especially on public subjects; a much more copious outlet,—which indeed, gradually widening itself, became the final solution for him. Of the year 1811 we have a pamphlet for him, entitled *Military Reform*; this is the second edition, "dedicated to the Duke of Kent;" the first appears to have come out the year before, and had thus attained a certain notice, which of course was encouraging. He now furthermore opened a correspondence with the *Times* newspaper; wrote to it, in 1812, a series of Letters under the signature *Vetus*: voluntary Letters I suppose, without payment or pre-engagement, one successful Letter calling out another; till *Vetus* and his doctrines came to be a distinguishable entity, and the business amounted to something. Out of my own earliest newspaper reading, I can remember the name *Vetus*, as a kind of editorial hacklog on which able editors were wont to chop straw now and then. Nay the Letters were collected and reprinted; both this first series, of 1812, and then a second of next year: two very thin, very dim-coloured cheap octavos; stray copies of which still exist, and may one day become distillable into a drop of history (should such be wanted of our poor "Scavenger Age" in time coming), though the reading of them has long ceased in this generation. The first series, we perceive, had even gone to a second edition. The tone, wherever one timidly glances into this extinct cockpit, is trenchant and emphatic: the name of *Vetus*, strenuously fighting there, had become considerable in the talking political world; and, no doubt, was especially of mark, as that of a writer who might otherwise be important, with the proprietors of the *Times*. The connexion continued; widened and deepened itself,—in a slow tentative manner; passing naturally from

voluntary into remunerated: and indeed proving more and more to be the true ultimate arena, and battlefield and seedfield, for the exuberant impetuousities and faculties of this man.'—Pp. 30—32.

In after days, Mr. Carlyle made his acquaintance.

'An amazingly impetuous, hasty, explosive man, this "Captain Whirlwind," as I used to call him! Great sensibility lay in him, too; a real sympathy, and affectionate pity and softness, which he had an over-tendency to express even by tears,—a singular sight in so leonine a man. Enemies called them maudlin and hypocritical, these tears; but that was nowise the complete account of them. On the whole, there did conspicuously lie a dash of ostentation, a self-consciousness apt to become loud and braggart, over all he said and did and felt: this was the alloy of the man, and you had to be thankful for the abundant gold along with it.

'Quizzing enough he got among us for all this, and for the singular *chiaroscuro* manner of procedure, like that of an Archimagus Cagliostro, or Kaiser Joseph Incognito, which his anonymous known-unknown thunderings in the *Times* necessitated in him; and much we laughed,—not without explosive counter-banterings on his part;—but in fine one could not do without him; one knew him at heart for a right brave man. "By Jove, sir!" thus he would swear to you, with radiant face; sometimes, not often, by a deeper oath. With persons of dignity, especially with women, to whom he was always very gallant, he had courtly delicate manners, verging towards the wiredrawn and elaborate; on common occasions, he bloomed out at once into jolly familiarity of the graceful and boisterous kind, reminding you of mess-rooms and old Dublin days. His off-hand mode of speech was always precise, emphatic, ingenious: his laugh, which was frequent rather than otherwise, had a sincerity of banter, but no real depth of sense for the ludicrous; and soon ended, if it grew too loud, in a mere dissonant scream. He was broad, well-built, stout of stature; had a long lowish head, sharp grey eyes, with large strong aquiline face to match; and walked, or sat, in an erect decisive manner. A remarkable man; and playing, especially in those years 1830-40, a remarkable part in the world.'—Pp. 303, 304.

Considering his doctrines, and his ordinary way of settling all public men and public proceedings, Mr. Carlyle is singularly tolerant towards Capt. Sterling and the *Times*. Indeed, but for the son, the father and his work could hardly have escaped, in Mr. Carlyle's *Inferno*, the place which their prominence in the nineteenth century would have suggested. But, on the contrary, he explains, and gives very good reasons for Capt. Sterling's having 'three hundred and sixty-five opinions in the year on every subject.' The sketch of Capt. Sterling, preparing during the day for his evening work, is characteristic:—

'For I must say of Edward Sterling, after all his daily explosive sophistries, and fallacies of talk, he had a stubborn instinctive sense of what was manful, strong and worthy; recognised, with quick feeling, the charlatan under his solemnest wig; knew as clearly as any man a pusillanimous tailor in buckram, an ass under the lion's skin, and did with his whole heart despise the same.

'The sudden changes of doctrine in the *Times*, which failed not to excite loud censure and indignant amazement in those days, were first intelligible to you when you came to interpret them as his changes. These sudden

whirls from east to west on his part, and total changes of party and articulate opinion at a day's warning, lay in the nature of the man, and could not be helped; products of his fiery impatience, of the combined impetuosity and limitation of an intellect, which did nevertheless continually gravitate towards what was loyal, true and right on all manner of subjects. These, as I define them, were the mere scoræ and pumice wreck of a steady central lava-flood, which truly was volcanic and explosive to a strange degree, but did rest as few others on the grand fire-depths of the world. . .

'For it may be said, the emphatic, big-voiced, always influential and often strongly unreasonable *Times* Newspaper, was the express emblem of Edward Sterling; he, more than any other man or circumstance, *was* the *Times* Newspaper, and thundered through it to the shaking of the spheres. And let us assert withal that his and its influence, in those days, was not ill grounded but rather well; that the loud manifold unreason, often enough vituperated and groaned over, was of the surface mostly; that his conclusions, unreasonable, partial, hasty as they might at first be, gravitated irresistibly towards the right: in virtue of which grand quality indeed, the root of all good insight in man, his *Times* oratory found acceptance, and influential audience, amid the loud whirl of an England itself logically very stupid, and wise chiefly by instinct.

'England listened to this voice, as all might observe; and to one who knew England and it, the result was not quite a strange one, and was honourable rather than otherwise to both parties. A good judge of men's talents has been heard to say of Edward Sterling: "There is not a *faculty of improvising* equal to this in all my circle. Sterling rushes out into the clubs, into London society, rolls about all day, copiously talking modish nonsense or sense, and listening to the like, with the multifarious miscellany of men; comes home at night; redacts it into a *Times* Leader,—and is found to have hit the essential purport of the world's immeasurable babblement that day, with an accuracy beyond all other men. This is what the multifarious Babel sound did mean to say in clear words; this, more nearly than anything else. Let the most gifted intellect, capable of writing epics, try to write such a Leader for the Morning Newspapers! No intellect but Edward Sterling's can do it. An improvising faculty without parallel in my experience."— Pp. 302, 304, 305.

To Mr. Carlyle the lovers of secret history will feel grateful for the curious notes which passed between Sir R. Peel and the Editor of the *Times*, at the end of Sir Robert's ministry, in 1835:—

'The support, by Edward Sterling and the *Times*, of Sir Robert Peel's first Ministry, and generally of Peel's statesmanship, was a conspicuous fact in its day; but the return it met with from the person chiefly interested may be considered well worth recording. The following Letter, after meandering through I know not what intricate conduits, and consultations of the Mysterious Entity whose address it bore, came to Edward Sterling as the real flesh-and-blood proprietor, and has been found among his papers. It is marked *Private*:

"(Private) To the Editor of the *Times*.

"Whitehall, April 18th, 1835.

"SIR,—Having this day delivered into the hands of the King the Seals of Office, I can, without any imputation of an interested motive, or any impediment from scrupulous feelings of delicacy, express my deep sense of the powerful support which that Government over which I had the honour to preside received from the *Times* Newspaper.

"If I do not offer the expressions of personal gratitude, it is because I feel that such expressions would do injustice to the character of a support which was given exclusively on the highest and most independent grounds of public principle. I can say this with perfect truth, as I am addressing one whose person even is unknown to me, and who during my tenure of Power studiously avoided every species of intercourse which could throw a suspicion upon the motives by which he was actuated. I should, however, be doing injustice to my own feelings, if I were to retire from Office without one word of acknowledgment; without at least assuring you of the admiration with which I witnessed, during the arduous contest in which I was engaged, the daily exhibition of that extraordinary ability to which I was indebted for a support, the more valuable because it was an impartial and discriminating support.—I have the honour to be, Sir,—Ever your most obedient and faithful servant,

"ROBERT PEEL."

'To which, with due loftiness and diplomatic gravity and brevity, there is Answer, Draught of Answer in Edward Sterling's hand, from the Mysterious Entity so honoured, in the following terms:

"To the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart. &c. &c. &c.

"SIR,—It gives me sincere satisfaction to learn from the Letter with which you have honoured me, bearing yesterday's date, that you estimate so highly the efforts which have been made during the last five months by the *Times* Newspaper, to support the cause of rational and wholesome Government which his Majesty had entrusted to your guidance; and that you appreciate fairly the disinterested motive, of regard to the public welfare, and to that alone, through which this Journal has been prompted to pursue a policy in accordance with that of your Administration. It is, permit me to say, by such motives only, that the *Times*, ever since I have known it, has been influenced, whether in defence of the Government of the day, or in constitutional resistance to it: and indeed there exist no other motives of action for a Journalist, compatible either with the safety of the press, or with the political morality of the great bulk of its readers.—With much respect, I have the honour to be, Sir, &c. &c. &c.

"THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES."

—Pp. 306—308.

There is not much to be said of Sterling's early life. Like many other young men, he was a strong Radical; called clergymen a set of 'black dragoons' quartered about the country, wrote in the then *Athenæum*, 'with a strange opulence of splendour,' we are told, 'a splendour hovering between the *raffaelesque* and the *japannish*;'—fraternised with clever Liberals and Spanish exiles. In those days—Mr. Carlyle did not know Sterling then—Coleridge was great and famous, and an oracle much consulted by clever young men. Coleridge won over Sterling, among others, to be his disciple; and to this first master of Sterling's mind, his second master devotes several pages of keen, minute, unsparing portrait-painting, more life-like than good-natured, which certainly will not be the last among the memorable passages of Mr. Carlyle. The two masters, too, are so strikingly like one another in many of the points so vividly brought out by one of them. Whatever each

may be to his own chosen school, it will hardly escape the gross thoughts of the outer world, that in his prophet character, his talk, and his aversion to coming to the point, the sage of Chelsea is the double of the sage of Highgate. Did it escape himself? Did it impart additional zest to his portraiture of his counterpart? or, at least, give him the means to make it more effective?

Here we have Coleridge, sitting apart on his hill, in view of the busiest of cities, and discoursing transcendently on many things to the visitors from it:—

‘Coleridge sat on the brow of Highgate Hill, in those years, looking down on London and its smoke tumult, like a sage escaped from the inanity of life's battle; attracting towards him the thoughts of innumerable brave souls still engaged there. His express contributions to poetry, philosophy, or any specific province of human literature or enlightenment, had been small and sadly intermittent; but he had, especially among young inquiring men, a higher than literary, a kind of prophetic or magician character. He was thought to hold, he alone in England, the key of German and other Transcendentalisms; knew the sublime secret of believing by “the reason” what “the understanding” had been obliged to fling out as incredible; and could still, after Hume and Voltaire had done their best and worst with him, profess himself an orthodox Christian, and say and print to the Church of England, with its singular old rubrics and surplices at Allhallowtide, *Esto perpetua*. A sublime man; who, alone in those dark days, had saved his crown of spiritual manhood; escaping from the black materialisms, and revolutionary deluges, with “God, Freedom, Immortality” still his: a king of men. The practical intellects of the world did not much heed him, or carelessly reckoned him a metaphysical dreamer: but to the rising spirits of the young generation he had this dusky sublime character; and sat there as a kind of *Magus*, girt in mystery and enigma; his Dodona oak-grove (Mr. Gilman's house at Highgate) whispering strange things, uncertain whether oracles or jargon.

The Gilmans did not encourage much company, or excitation of any sort, round their sage; nevertheless access to him, if a youth did reverently wish it, was not difficult. He would stroll about the pleasant garden with you, sit in the pleasant rooms of the place,—perhaps take you to his own peculiar room, high up, with a rearward view, which was the chief view of all. A really charming outlook, in fine weather. Close at hand, wide sweep of flowery leafy gardens, their few houses mostly hidden, the very chimney-pots veiled under blossomy umbrage, flowed gloriously down hill; gloriously issuing in wide-tufted undulating plain-country, rich in all charms of field and town. Waving blooming country of the brightest green; dotted all over with handsome villas, handsome groves; crossed by roads and human traffic, here inaudible or heard only as a musical hum: and behind all swam, under olive-tinted haze, the illimitable limitary ocean of London, with its domes and steeples definite in the sun, big Paul's and the many memories attached to it hanging high over all. Nowhere, of its kind, could you see a grander prospect on a bright summer day, with the set of the air going southward,—southward, and so draping with the city-smoke not *you* but the city. Here for hours would Coleridge talk, concerning all conceivable or inconceivable things. . . .

‘The good man, he was now getting old, towards sixty perhaps; and gave you the idea of a life that had been full of sufferings; a life heavy-laden, half-vanquished, still swimming painfully in seas of manifold physical and

other bewilderment. Brow and head were round, and of massive weight, but the face was flabby and irresolute. The deep eyes, of a light hazel, were as full of sorrow as of inspiration; confused pain looked mildly from them, as in a kind of mild astonishment. The whole figure and air, good and amiable otherwise, might be called flabby and irresolute; expressive of weakness under possibility of strength. He hung loosely on his limbs, with knees bent, and stooping attitude; in walking, he rather shuffled than decisively stepped; and a lady once remarked, he never could fix which side of the garden-walk would suit him best, but continually shifted, in corkscrew fashion, and kept trying both. A heavy-laden, high-aspiring and surely much-suffering man. His voice, naturally soft and good, had contracted itself into a plaintive snuffle and singsong; he spoke as if preaching,—you would have said, preaching earnestly and also hopelessly the weightiest things. I still recollect his “object” and “subject,” terms of continual recurrence in the Kantean province; and how he sung and snuffled them into “om-m-mject” and “sum-m-mject,” with a kind of solemn shake or quaver, as he rolled along. No talk, in his century or in any other, could be more surprising.—Pp. 69—71.

Here Mr. Carlyle had listened to him, with sharp observation and a good memory for tones and manner, which enable him to concede that Coleridge could *sometimes* speak plain:—

‘Sterling in after times did not complain of his unintelligibility, or imputed it only to the abstruse high nature of the topics handled. Let us hope so, let us try to believe so! There is no doubt but Coleridge could speak plain words on things plain: his observations and responses on the trivial matters that occurred were as simple as the commonest man’s, or were even distinguished by superior simplicity as well as pertinency. “Ah, your tea is too cold, Mr. Coleridge!” mourned the good Mrs. Gilman once, in her kind, reverential and yet protective manner, handing him a very tolerable though belated cup.—“It’s better than I deserve!” snuffled he, in a low hoarse murmur, partly courteous, chiefly pious, the tone of which still abides with me: “It’s better than I deserve!”’—P. 75.

Mr. Carlyle, take care how you make remarks over your tea.

But Mr. Carlyle has other reminiscences of talk, not plain or concise—talk that went on unbroken for hours, and which he found it difficult to comprehend. He corrects Sterling’s account:—

‘Sterling, who assiduously attended him, with profound reverence, and was often with him by himself, for a good many months, gives a record of their first colloquy. Their colloquies were numerous, and he had taken note of many; but they are all gone to the fire, except this first, which Mr. Hare has printed,—unluckily without date. It contains a number of ingenious, true and half-true observations, and is of course a faithful epitome of the things said; but it gives small idea of Coleridge’s way of talking;—this one feature is perhaps the most recognisable. “Our interview lasted for three hours, during which he talked two hours and three quarters.”’—Pp. 71, 72.

Here are his own recollections. We have never heard Mr. Carlyle’s voice. But in his writings he talks to us. Had conscience nothing to say, at the time when he was ‘flinging down on paper’ these vivid images?

' Nothing could be more copious than his talk; and furthermore, it was always, virtually or literally, of the nature of a monologue; suffering no interruption, however reverent; hastily putting aside all foreign additions, annotations, or most ingenuous desires for elucidation, as well-meant superfluities which would never do. Besides, it was talk not flowing anywhere like a river, but *spreading everywhere in inextricable currents and regurgitations like a lake or sea; terribly deficient in definite goal or aim, nay often in logical intelligibility; what you were to believe or do, on any earthly or heavenly thing, obstinately refusing to appear from it.* So that, most times, you felt logically lost; *swamped near to drowning in this tide of ingenious vocables, spreading out boundless as if to submerge the world.*'—P. 72.

Once more:—

' The constant gist of his discourse was lamentation over the sunk condition of the world; which he recognised to be given up to Atheism and Materialism, full of mere sordid misbeliefs, mispursuits and misresults. All Science had become mechanical; the science not of men, but of a kind of human beavers. Churches themselves had died away into a godless mechanical condition; and stood there as mere Cases of Articles, mere Forms of Churches; like the dried carcasses of once swift camels, which you find left withering in the thirst of the universal desert,—ghastly portents for the present, beneficent ships of the desert no more. Men's souls were blinded, hebeted; sunk under the influence of Atheism and Materialism, and Hume and Voltaire: the world for the present was as an extinct world, deserted of God, and incapable of well-doing till it changed its heart and spirit. This, expressed, I think, with less of indignation, and with more of long-drawn querulousness, was always recognisable as the ground tone.'—Pp. 75, 76

So far Mr. Carlyle would quite agree with him, except that he would be indignant, where Coleridge was querulous. What, then, was Coleridge's great sin? For some great sin there plainly was. Mr. Carlyle, whose great instrument is producing an impression, would not else have prepared us for the doctrines, by such an impression of the man. His sin is, that he thought he saw a remedy, and saw it in the English Church—'the thing,' as Mr. Carlyle speaks, 'called the Church of England.'

' The remedy, though Coleridge himself professed to see it as in sunbeams, could not, except by processes unspeakably difficult, be described to you at all. On the whole, those dead Churches, this dead English Church especially, must be brought to life again. Why not? It was not dead; the soul of it, in this parched-up body, was tragically asleep only. Atheistic Philosophy was true on its side, and Hume and Voltaire could on their own ground speak irrefragably for themselves against any Church: but lift the Church and them into a higher sphere of argument, *they* died into inanition, the Church revived itself into pristine florid vigour—became once more a living ship of the desert, and invincibly bore you over stock and stone. But how, but how! By attending to the "reason" of man, said Coleridge, and duly chaining up the "understanding" of man, the *Vernunft* (Reason) and *Verstand* (Understanding) of the Germans, it all turned upon these, if you could well understand them—which you couldn't. . . .

' The truth is, I now see, Coleridge's talk and speculation was the emblem of himself: in it as in him, a ray of heavenly inspiration struggled, in a

tragically ineffectual degree, with the weakness of flesh and blood. He says once, he "had skirted the howling deserts of Infidelity;" this was evident enough: but he had not had the courage, in defiance of pain and terror, to press resolutely across said deserts to the new firm lands of Faith beyond; he preferred to create logical fatamorganas for himself on this hither side, and laboriously solace himself with these.

'To the man himself Nature had given, in high measure, the seeds of a noble endowment; and to unfold it had been forbidden him. A subtle lynx-eyed intellect, tremulous pious sensibility to all good and all beautiful; truly a ray of empyrean light, but imbedded in such weak laxity of character, in such indolences and esuriences, had made strange work with it. Once more the tragic story of a high endowment with an insufficient will.—Pp. 76—78.

Such is the account of the character and usefulness of one of the great irregular authorities of our day, by another of the same kind. As a caricature, it is keen and hard-hitting, with some discernible truth in it, as all caricature must have. Coleridge's friends would certainly not allow it more; and, except that it is just now Mr. Carlyle's turn to have the laugh on his side, no ground appears why any one else should. Coleridge was a believer, and was serious in his belief; moreover, though it is a bare assumption of Mr. Carlyle's that the High Church movement is owing to him, he had many sympathies with the English Church. Mr. Carlyle has made up his mind that these are not matters to be serious about, and gives himself the rein accordingly. There is no arguing in such cases about fair or unfair. But as we read, and are amused, the conviction is not to be repressed, that Coleridge will yet find his avenger.

Sterling's pertinacious respect for Coleridge is a sore point with Mr. Carlyle. 'Sterling,' he says, 'never spoke much to me of his intercourse with Coleridge, and when he did compare notes about him, it was usually rather in the way of controversial discussion than of narrative.' Sterling, too, keen and critical as he was, did not 'in after times complain of his unintelligibility.' Coleridge had first given a serious impulse to Sterling's mind, which probably continued, though greatly weakened, to the end; and thus, in a manner, Coleridge was still meeting Mr. Carlyle at every turn when the latter became Sterling's friend. Coleridge fed Sterling with the 'thrice refined pabulum of transcendental moonshine,' and led him 'into an adventure,' for which, with all his love, Mr. Carlyle has barely forgiven Sterling:—the step—taken, as far as appears, in perfect good faith, though Mr. Carlyle, from the 'necessity of his position,' cannot believe it—of becoming Archdeacon Hare's curate.

His view of Sterling's position as a clergyman is not creditable to his consistency or his boasted wide and just insight. It is governed all through simply by blind ill-temper. He cannot bear religion, or anything that has to do with it; and further, he

cannot restrain his dislike. This, which he shares with meaner and unphilosophic men, is plainly the account—a very common-place and vulgar one—of a representation of his friend's motives and acts, which, from all that appears in his book, is simply gratuitous.

Sterling took orders, under solemn and remorseful feelings at the violent death of a friend, to which he had involuntarily contributed, and at the advice of one whom he trusted. It may have been hastily done; but all Sterling's acts were hasty. Mr. Carlyle chooses to think and say, that he was—not of course consciously, but really—playing false to his convictions. He worked for eight months, according to Mr. Carlyle's concession, as a zealous and useful clergyman. His health gayed away, and he retired; but, on Mr. Carlyle's own showing, without the remotest idea of 'consciously quitting the clerical profession, far less the Church as a creed,' and was only prevented by ill-health from setting to work again. He even tried to do so, in spite of his doctors:—

'It turned out afterwards, he had, unknown even to his own family, during a good many weeks in the coldest period of next spring, when it was really dangerous for his health, and did prove hurtful to it,—been constantly performing the morning service in some chapel in Bayswater for a young clerical neighbour, a slight acquaintance of his, who was sickly at the time. So far as I know, this of the Bayswater Chapel in the spring of 1836, a feat severely rebuked by his doctor withal, was his last actual service as a churchman. But the conscious life ecclesiastical still hung visibly about his inner unconscious and real life, for years to come; and not till by slow degrees he had unwinded from him the wrappings of it, could he become clear about himself, and so much as try heartily what his now sole course was. Alas, and he had to live all the rest of his days, as in continual flight for his very existence; "ducking under like a poor unfledged partridge-bird," as one described it, "before the mower; darting continually from nook to nook, and there crouching, to escape the scythe of death,"'
—P. 161.

Mr. Carlyle chooses to think, against all remaining appearances, that sickness was but the superficial reason; that the real one was, that he felt that he *had* been untrue to his conscience. We can have but little sympathy with Mr. Sterling's later course: but it is simply unjust to him, for Mr. Carlyle, because he chooses to think that no honest man *can* believe in Christianity and the Church, to play thus, while writing biography, into the hands of his own theory, and make materials for supporting it out of the reputation of his friend.

It appears, too, as we have said, that these eight months were not wasted:—

'By Mr. Hare's account, no priest of any Church could more fervently address himself to his functions than Sterling now did. He went about among the poor, the ignorant, and those that had need of help; zealously

forwarded schools and beneficences; strove, with his whole might, to instruct and aid whosoever suffered consciously in body, or still worse unconsciously in mind. He had charged himself to make the Apostle Paul his model; the perils and voyagings and ultimate martyrdom of Christian Paul, in those old ages, on the great scale, were to be translated into detail, and become the practical emblem of Christian Sterling on the coast of Sussex in this new age. "It would be no longer from Jerusalem to Damascus," writes Sterling, "to Arabia, to Derbe, Lystra, Ephesus, that he would travel: but each house of his appointed Parish would be to him what each of those great cities was,—a place where he would bend his whole being, and spend his heart for the conversion, purification, elevation of those under his influence. The whole man would be for ever at work for this purpose; head, heart, knowledge, time, body, possessions, all would be directed to this end." A high enough model set before one:—how to be realized! Sterling hoped to realize it, to struggle towards realizing it, in some small degree. This is Mr. Hare's report of him:—

"He was continually devising some fresh scheme for improving the condition of the Parish. His aim was to awaken the minds of the people, to arouse their conscience, to call forth their sense of moral responsibility, to make them feel their own sinfulness, their need of redemption, and thus lead them to a recognition of the Divine Love by which that redemption is offered to us. In visiting them he was diligent in all weathers, to the risk of his own health, which was greatly impaired thereby; and his gentleness and considerate care for the sick won their affection; so that, though his stay was very short, his name is still, after a dozen years, cherished by many."

"So in those actual leafy lanes, on the edge of Pevensey Level, in this new age, did our poor New Paul (on hest of certain oracles) diligently study to comport himself,—and struggle with all his might *not* to be a moonshine shadow of the First Paul.'—Pp. 131—134.

Just these eight months were directly devoted to a work, which Christian and infidel must alike hold to be one of the highest that man can do,—guiding, strengthening, consoling, educating, those who most want such help; it was done, too, with heartiness and success. And it is just to these eight months, in the course of Sterling's desultory and speculative life, that Mr. Carlyle denies—what he is so lavish of, to the years both before and after—the praise of honest action.

'Alas, if we did remember the divine and awful nature of God's truth, and had not so forgotten it as poor doomed creatures never did before,—should we, durst we in our most audacious moments, think of wedding *it* to the world's untruth, which is also, like all untruths, the devil's? Only in the world's last lethargy can such things be done, and accounted safe and pious! Fools! "Do you think the Living God is a buzzard idol," sternly asks Milton, that you dare address Him in this manner? . . . It is not now known, what never needed proof or statement before, that Religion is not a doubt; that it is a certainty,—or else a mockery and horror. That none or all of the many things we are in doubt about, and need to have demonstrated and rendered probable, can by any alchemy be made a "Religion" for us; but are and must continue a baleful, quiet or unquiet, Hypocrisy for us; and bring—*salvation*, do we fancy? I think it is another thing they will bring; and are, on all hands, visibly bringing, this good while!'—Pp. 127, 128.

'In short, it was a strange enough symptom to me of the bewildered

condition of the world, to behold a man of this temper, and of this veracity and nobleness, self-consecrated here, by free volition and deliberate selection, to be a Christian Priest; and zealously struggling to fancy himself such in very truth.'—P. 164.

Is a man honest only, honestly at work only, with his pen in his hand, and a brilliant and exciting literature all round him, 'searching after truth'—and not so, drudging in the village school, and comforting the sick? Is religion so fatal a thing, that even from these services of charity, it must take away their praise?

Unless Mr. Carlyle is prepared to go so far, it ought to have occurred to him as matter of consolation in these evil days, that what Sterling did for eight months, hundreds of men, most of them his inferiors in talent, are doing all their lives long, equally vigorously, and equally usefully, whose only disqualification for the praise of honest workers is their belief in Christianity.

Shortly after Sterling's ordination, Mr. Carlyle became personally acquainted with him—an exceedingly important event in Sterling's life. The account of their intercourse is the interesting part of the book. Here, bringing up the past as it was once present in its actual moments,—bringing up all that was so slight at the time, yet proves to be so imperishably impressed on sense and feeling—scenes and spots, looks and attitudes, sunny hours or rainy ones, condensations or flashings out of character in a passing word—in all this, Mr. Carlyle is in his true element. The means by which he produces the effect are easy to criticize one by one; but he does make the real feeling of passing life present to your mind. He knows the value of reminiscences in detail. When he notes his first hearing vaguely of Sterling, then across the seas, from 'John Mill and Mrs. Austin,'—remembers him as 'hanging in his imagination like a spot of bright colours, rather than a portrait with features,'—goes on a year or two, and notices a further step—Sterling's novel, 'Arthur Coningsby,' sent down to him by John Mill to Scotland, and read in the summer days among the moors—and gets at length to the sight of the man himself, and the insignificant visit that gave it, many will recollect, how in the case of friends of their own, dim names, first scarcely noticed, took form and feature through the trifling and chance accidents of daily conversation, till it became difficult to imagine the time when they had *not* been known.

Here is the first interview; the chance afternoon visit in the City—the expectation, not quite fulfilled—the lounging figure, abrupt, rapid and bright-eyed—the two men taking to one another, and walking westwards together—are the slightest conceivable materials for a record; but they carry life with them:—

'It was on this his February expedition to London that I first saw Sterling,—at the India House incidentally, one afternoon, where I found him in company with John Mill, whom I happened like himself to be visiting for a few minutes. The sight of one whose fine qualities I had often heard of lately, was interesting enough; and, on the whole, proved not disappointing, though it was the translation of dream into fact, that is of poetry into prose, and showed its unrhymed side withal. A loose, careless-looking, thin figure, in careless dim costume, sat, in a lounging posture, carelessly and copiously talking. I was struck with the kindly but restless swift-glancing eyes, which looked as if the spirits were all out coursing like a pack of merry eager beagles, beating every bush. The brow, rather sloping in form, was not of imposing character, though again the head was longish, which is always the best sign of intellect; the physiognomy in general indicated animation rather than strength.

'We talked rapidly of various unmemorable things: I remember coming on the Negroes, and noticing that Sterling's notions on the Slavery Question had not advanced into the stage of mine. . . . His address, I perceived, was abrupt, unceremonious; probably not at all disinclined to logic, and capable of dashing in upon you like a charge of cossacks, on occasion: but it was also eminently ingenious, social, guileless. We did all very well together: and Sterling and I walked westward in company, choosing whatever lanes or quietest streets there were, as far as Knightsbridge, where our roads parted; talking on moralities, theological philosophies; arguing copiously, but *except* in opinion not disagreeing.

'In his notions on such subjects, the expected Coleridge cast of thought was very visible; and he seemed to express it even with exaggeration, and in a fearless dogmatic manner. Identity of sentiment, difference of opinion: these are the known elements of a pleasant dialogue. We parted with the mutual wish to meet again;—which accordingly, at his father's house and at mine, we soon repeatedly did; and already, in the few days before his return to Herstonceux, had laid the foundations of a frank intercourse, pointing towards pleasant intimacies both with himself and with his circle, which in the future were abundantly fulfilled. His mother, essentially and even professedly "Scotch," took to my wife gradually with a most kind maternal relation; his father, a gallant showy stirring gentleman, the magus of the *Times*, had talk and argument ever ready, was an interesting figure, and more and more took interest in us. We had unconsciously made an acquisition, which grew richer and wholesomer with every new year; and ranks now, seen in the pale moonlight of memory, and must ever rank, among the precious possessions of life.'—Pp. 139—141.

The best part of the book is made up of sketches of this kind. We have Sterling logical and clear, taking to task his friend's peculiarities, who finds himself 'unable, as usual, to get any practical hold of' the lesson:—

'I remember dialogues with him, of that year; one pleasant dialogue under the trees of the Park (where now, in 1851, is the thing called "Crystal Palace"), with the June sunset flinging long shadows for us; the last of the Quality just vanishing for dinner, and the great Night beginning to prophesy of itself. Our talk (like that of the foregoing letter) was of the faults of my style, of my way of thinking, of my &c. &c.; all which admonitions and remonstrances, so friendly and innocent, from this young junior-senior, I was willing to listen to, though unable, as usual, to get almost any practical hold of them. As usual, the garments do not fit you, you are lost in the garments, or you cannot get into them at all; this is not your suit of clothes, it must be another's:—alas, these are not your dimen-

sions, these are only the optical angles you subtend; on the whole, you will never get measured in that way!—Pp. 156, 157.

Another time Mr. Carlyle is 'sitting under' his friend in an empty church in Cheapside, and finding it rather dull, speculates on the possibility of 'firing a musket through the church, without hitting a Christian:—

'This was properly my only specimen of Sterling's preaching. Another time, late in the same autumn, I did indeed attend him one evening to some church in the City,—a big church behind Cheapside, "built by Wren" as he carefully informed me;—but there, in my wearied mood, the chief subject of reflection was the almost total vacancy of the place, and how an eloquent soul was preaching to mere lamps and prayer-books; and of the sermon I retain no image. It came up in the way of banter, if he ever urged the duty of "church extension," which already he very seldom did and at length never, what a specimen we once had of bright lamps, gilt prayer-books, baize-lined pews, Wren-built architecture; and how, in almost all directions, you might have fired a musket through the church, and hit no Christian life. A terrible outlook indeed for the apostolic labourer in the brick-and-mortar line!—Pp. 157, 158.

A sufficiently shallow reflection for Mr. Carlyle to have made several times over.

At another time we have them 'shuttling' about London in cabs, and talking eagerly, in spite of the street uproar, to save time; or there is the recollection, not to be despised, of a long May-day's ride:—

'His visits, which were usually of two or three days, were always full of business, rapid in movement as all his life was. To me, if possible, he would come in the evening; a whole cornucopia of talk and speculation was to be discharged. If the evening would not do, and my affairs otherwise permitted, I had to mount into cabs with him; fly far and wide, shuttling athwart the big Babel, wherever his calls and pauses had to be. This was his way to husband time! Our talk, in such straitened circumstances, was loud or low as the circumambient groaning rage of wheels and sound prescribed,—very loud it had to be in such thoroughfares as London Bridge and Cheapside; but except while he was absent, off for minutes into some banker's office, lawyer's, stationer's, haberdasher's or what office there might be, it never paused. In this way extensive strange dialogues were carried on: to me also very strange,—private friendly colloquies, on all manner of rich subjects, held thus amid the chaotic roar of things. Sterling was full of speculations, observations and bright sallies; vividly awake to what was passing in the world; glanced pertinently with victorious clearness, without spleen, though often enough with a dash of mockery, into its Puseyisms, Liberalisms, literary Lionisms, or what else the mad hour might be producing,—always prompt to recognise what grain of sanity might be in the same. He was opulent in talk, and the rapid movement and vicissitude on such occasions seemed to give him new excitement.

'Once, I still remember,—it was some years before, probably in May, on his return from Madeira,—he undertook a day's riding with me; once and never again. We coursed extensively over the Hampstead and Highgate regions, and the country beyond, sauntering or galloping through many leafy lanes and pleasant places, in everflowing, everchanging talk; and returned down Regent-street at nightfall: one of the cheerfulest days I

ever had;—not to be repeated, said the Fates. Sterling was charming on such occasions: at once a child and a gifted man. A serious fund of thought he always had, a serious drift you never missed in him; nor indeed had he much depth of real laughter or sense of the ludicrous, as I have elsewhere said; but what he had was genuine, free, and continual: his sparkling sallies bubbled up as from aerated natural fountains; a mild dash of gaiety was native to the man, and had moulded his physiognomy in a very graceful way. We got once into a cab, about Charing-cross; I know not now whence or well whitherward, nor that our haste was at all special; however, the cabman, sensible that his pace was slowish, took to whipping, with a steady, passionless, business-like assiduity which, though the horse seemed lazy rather than weak, became afflictive; and I urged remonstrance with the savage fellow: "Let him alone," answered Sterling; "he is kindling the enthusiasm of his horse, you perceive; that is the first thing, then we shall do very well!"—as accordingly we did.—Pp. 246—248.

Or we have a wicked sketch of one of Sterling's friends, 'the good little Frank':—

'Among the quondam Cambridge acquaintances I have seen with Sterling about this time, one struck me, less from his qualities than from his name and genealogy: Frank Edgeworth, youngest son of the well-known Lovell Edgeworth, youngest brother of the celebrated Maria Edgeworth, the Irish novelist. Frank was a short neat man; of sleek, square, colourless face (resembling the portraits of his father), with small blue eyes in which twinkled curiously a joyless smile; his voice was croaky and shrill, with a tone of shrewish obstinacy in it, and perhaps of sarcasm withal. A composed, dogmatic, speculative, exact, and not melodious man. He was learned in Plato and likewise in Kant; well-read in philosophies and literatures; entertained not creeds, but the Platonic or Kantian *ghosts* of creeds; coldly sneering away from him, in the joyless twinkle of those eyes, in the inexorable jingle of that shrill voice, all manner of Toryisms, superstitions: for the rest, a man of perfect veracity, of great diligence, and other worth;—notable to see alongside of Sterling. . . .

'This good little Edgeworth had roved extensively about the Continent; had married a young Spanish wife, whom by a romantic accident he came upon in London: having really good scholarship, and consciousness of faculty and fidelity, he now hoped to find support in preparing young men for the University, in taking pupils to board; and with this view, was endeavouring to form an establishment somewhere in the environs;—ignorant that it is mainly the Clergy whom simple persons trust with that trade at present; that his want of a patent of orthodoxy, not to say his inexorable secret heterodoxy of mind, would far override all other qualifications in the estimate of simple persons, who are afraid of many things, and not afraid of hypocrisy, which is the worst and one irremediably bad thing. Poor Edgeworth tried this business for a while, but found no success at all; went across, after a year or two, to native Edgeworthstown, in Longford, to take the management of his brother's estate; in which function it was said he shone, and had quite given up philosophies and speculations, and become a taciturn grim landmanager and county magistrate, likely to do much good in that department; when we learned next that he was dead, that we should see him no more. The good little Frank!—Pp. 171, 173.

Sterling's letters, lively, agreeable, gossiping ones from abroad, hardly do enough, in proportion to the room they take up, to give reality to the narrative. They have not, what Sterling says Carlyle's letters have, 'the writer's signature in

every word, as well as at the end.' More is done by scraps, fragmentary though they are and few, of the conversation of the two men: the one, rapid, eager, doing with ease what he could do at all, and setting its full value on his work, with an ostentation amusing rather than anything worse; in talk, flashing and brilliant 'as sheet-lightning,' and at times 'crackling with 'his dexterous petulancies, making the air all like needles 'round you—there was no end to his logic when you excited 'it—no end, except in some form of silence on your part;—the other enjoying the spirit and brilliancy which was playing round him, the disputatiousness and the real docility of his friend,—getting visibly the worst of it in all argumentative encounters, enouncing ironical paradoxes, which his friend found delightful game for his straightforward logic,—yet, in the up-shot receiving the reverend homage of the weaker mind, which he could not silence.

Thus Sterling is shown, in a letter, which we have already quoted from, commenting in admiring mystification, on the wondrous words and opinions of Herr Teufelsdröckh. Again, 'he finds in all his conversations with Carlyle, that his fundamental position is the good of evil.' Even when defending and interpreting Carlyle in the 'Westminster,' he is an obstinate arguer:—

'Sterling's gainsaying had given way on many points; but on others it continued stiff as ever, as may be seen in that article; indeed he fought Parthian-like in such cases, holding out his last position as doggedly as the first: and to some of my notions he seemed to grow in stubbornness of opposition, with the growing inevitability, and never would surrender. Especially that doctrine of the "greatness and fruitfulness of Silence," remained afflictive and incomprehensible: "Silence?" he would say; "Yes, truly; if they give you leave to proclaim silence by cannon-salvoes! My Harpocrates-Stentor!" In like manner, "Intellect and Virtue," how they are proportional, or are indeed one gift in us, the same great summary of gifts; and again, "Might and Right," the identity of these two, if a man will understand this God's-Universe, and that only he who conforms to the law of *it* can in the long-run have any "might:" all this, at the first blush, often awakened Sterling's musketry upon me, and many volleys I have had to stand,—the thing not being decidable by that kind of weapon or strategy.

'In such cases your one method was to leave our friend in peace. By small-arms practice no mortal could dislodge him; but if you were in the right, the silent hours would work continually for you; and Sterling, more certainly than any man, would and must at length swear fealty to the right, and passionately adopt it, burying all hostilities under foot.'—Pp. 249, 250.

But in spite of this stiff gainsaying, Mr. Carlyle did prevail, and found, not only a disciple, but a vigorous shield-bearer and champion; and comments with no small satisfaction on his friend's recognition of 'his own poor battle' in the world:—

'The first generous human recognition, expressed with heroic emphasis, and clear conviction visible amid its fiery exaggeration, that one's poor

battle in this world is not quite a mad and futile, that it is perhaps a worthy and manful one, which will come to something yet: this fact is a memorable one in every history; and for me Sterling, often enough the stiff gainsayer in our private communings, was the doer of this. The thought burnt in me like a lamp, for several days; lighting up into a kind of heroic splendour the sad volcanic wrecks, abysses and convulsions of said poor battle; and secretly I was very grateful to my daring friend, and am still, and ought to be. What the public might be thinking about him and his audacities, and me in consequence, or whether it thought at all, I never learned, or much heeded to learn.—Pp. 248, 249.

With one part of Sterling's intellectual bent, Carlyle seems to have quarrelled in real earnest. Sterling took interest in art, and was obstinately determined to try and write poetry. Mr. Carlyle, it appears, professes a feeling about art, which, if he were a Preaching Friar, we should respect—as he is Mr. Carlyle, the writer, philosopher, and literary man, we cannot at all. His ill-humour in this case, as in so many others, makes him shallow. He is writing, not acting; and he mistakes want of discrimination for breadth and earnestness:—

‘It is expected in this Nineteenth Century that a man of culture shall understand and worship Art: among the windy gospels addressed to our poor Century there are few louder than this of Art;—and if the Century expects that every man shall do his duty, surely Sterling was not the man to balk it! Various extracts from these picture-surveys are given in Hare; the others, I suppose, Sterling himself subsequently destroyed, not valuing them much.

‘Certainly no stranger could address himself more eagerly to reap what artistic harvest Rome offers, which is reckoned the peculiar produce of Rome among cities under the sun; to all galleries, churches, sistine chapels, ruins, coliseums, and artistic or dilettante shrines he zealously pilgrimed; and had much to say then and afterwards, and with real technical and historical knowledge, I believe, about the objects of devotion there. But it often struck me as a question, Whether all this even to himself was not, more or less, a nebulous kind of element; prescribed not by Nature and her verities, but by the Century expecting every man to do his duty? Whether not perhaps, in good part, temporary dilettante cloudland of our poor Century;—or can it be the real diviner Pisgah height, and everlasting mount of vision, for man's soul in any Century? And I think Sterling himself bent towards a negative conclusion, in the course of years. Certainly, of all subjects this was the one I cared least to hear even Sterling talk of: indeed it is a subject on which earnest men, abhorrent of hypocrisy and speech that has no meaning, are admonished to silence in this sad time, and had better, in such a Babel as we have got into for the present, “perambulate their picture-gallery with little or no speech.”—Pp. 228, 229.

This, from one who thought that ‘getting Goethe read through,’ was the chief medicine for Sterling's mind, wants more explanation than is given by the statement, that there was ‘another, and to him much more earnest kind of “art” at Rome,’ and that, for himself, he should have looked with much more interest at the Pope and Cardinals:—

'It is greatly fitter still (little as we are used that way) to shudder in pity and abhorrence over the scandalous tragedy, transcendent nadir of human ugliness and contemptibility, which under the daring title of religious worship, and practical recognition of the Highest God, daily and hourly everywhere transacts itself there. And, alas, not there only, but elsewhere, everywhere more or less.'—Pp. 231, 232.

He professes the same general contempt for poetry, at least in times like ours. Sterling's 'patience must have been tried' with Carlyle's criticisms—Carlyle's certainly was with Sterling's pertinacity in writing poetry. He wanted ear, he wanted talent for it—yet he would go on, in what is, after all, unprofitable. It tempts Mr. Carlyle to be unusually severe:—

'His reading, it might have been added, had much hurt the effect of the piece: a dreary pulpit or even conventicle manner; that flattest moaning hoo-hoo of predetermined pathos, with a kind of rocking canter introduced by way of intonation, each stanza the exact fellow of the other, and the dull swing of the rocking-horse duly in each;—no reading could be more unfavourable to Sterling's poetry than his own. Such a mode of reading, and indeed generally in a man of such vivacity the total absence of all gifts for playacting or artistic mimicry in any kind, was a noticeable point.'—P. 190.

'Why *sing* your bits of thoughts, if you *can* contrive to speak them? By your thought, not by your mode of delivering it, you must live or die.—Besides I had to observe there was in Sterling intrinsically no depth of *tune*. . . . Sterling's verses had a monotonous rub-a-dub, instead of tune; no trace of music deeper than that of a well-beaten drum, to which limited range of excellence the substance also corresponded, being intrinsically always a rhymed and slightly rhythmical *speech*, not a *song*.

'In short, all seemed to me to say, in his case: "You can speak with supreme excellence; sing with considerable excellence you never can. And the age itself, does it not, beyond most ages, demand and require clear speech; an age incapable of being sung to, in any but a trivial manner, till these convulsive agonies and wild revolutionary overturnings readjust themselves? Intelligible word of command, not musical psalmody and fiddling, is possible in this fell storm of battle. Beyond all ages, our age admonishes whatsoever thinking or writing man it has. Oh! speak to me, some wise intelligible speech, your wise meaning, in the shortest and clearest way; behold, I am dying for want of wise meaning, and insight into the devouring fact: speak, if you have any wisdom! As to song so-called, and your fiddling talent,—even if you have one, much more if you have none,—we will talk of that a couple of centuries hence, when things are calmer again. Homer shall be thrice welcome; but only when Troy is *taken*: alas! while the siege lasts, and battle's fury rages everywhere, what can I do with the Homer? I want Achilleus and Odysseus, and am enraged to see them trying to be Homers!"'—Pp. 253, 254.

These fragments give some idea of the intercourse between the two men. On the part of Sterling, it was to the last, frank, trustful, affectionate, and admiring: 'Towards me,' he says in his last letter to Carlyle, a few weeks before his death,— 'Towards me it is still more true than towards England, that 'no man has been and done like you. Heaven bless you!' The last soon came; strength ebbd; a life of wandering did not restore it. Bordeaux, Madeira, Naples, were in vain, and

only steps to melancholy Ventnor. His family began to break up. His father was no longer the 'gallant gentleman' of old: his mother died; his wife just heard the tidings, and the same day died also. He bore up, we are told, bravely and serenely—and at length he went also. He is buried in the churchyard of Bonchurch.

We have seen the two men meet for the first time; we will see them part for the last:—just after Sterling's great troubles, and about a year before his death. There is still the characteristic disputativeness—Sterling 'positive, wrong' about Cromwell, and in spite of Carlyle's assertions, leaving off unconvinced. The details of the interview, the abrupt departure, the 'warm, queer old room at the inn,' the 'carpeted backstairs,' the leave-taking 'under the dim skies,'—are just the things which every man's memory retains of such occasions, and prizes for their very homeliness:—

'One evening, I remember he came down hither, designing to have a freer talk with us. We were all sad enough, and strove rather to avoid speaking of what might make us sadder. Before any true talk had been got into, an interruption occurred—some unwelcome arrival: Sterling abruptly rose, gave me the signal to rise, and we unpolitely walked away, adjourning to his Hotel, which I recollect was in the Strand, near Hungerford Market; some ancient comfortable quaint-looking place, off the street; where, in a good warm queer old room, the remainder of our colloquy was duly finished. We spoke of Cromwell, among other things which I have now forgotten; on which subject Sterling was trenchant, positive, and in some essential points, wrong,—as I said I would convince him some day. "Well, well!" answered he, with a shake of the head.—We parted before long; bedtime for invalids being come: he escorted me down certain carpeted backstairs, and would not be forbidden: we took leave under the dim skies;—and alas! little as I then dreamt of it, this, so far as I can calculate, must have been the last time I ever saw him in the world. Softly as a common evening, the last of the evenings had passed away, and no other would come for me for evermore.'—Pp. 324, 325.

And so they parted. Such a parting is always awful; especially when he who goes had owed so much of what is now irrevocable to him who stays.

It is of course no more than Mr. Carlyle intends us to infer, that the change in Sterling's mind was in great measure due to him. The picture through the book is of an eager, questioning, clear mind, bending very gradually before an uncouth, massive, deep one; of an influence, not intentional, but irresistible, communicating not so much the opinions, which were of secondary importance, as the colour, and temper, and taste of the stouter and firmer mind, to the slighter and more brilliant one. There is a singular silence nearly all through, as to definite opinions on both sides; but there is the intention to convey with the utmost significance the impression of a growing and decisive change, in one of them, of all that regulates opinion.

Sterling began as a Christian and a Clergyman. He began with a sympathy for the wise and good of Christendom, and 'with the great body of those who are now endeavouring to guide 'and help onwards their fellow men.' He began as a believer in the Christian Faith. Mr. Carlyle indeed is pleased to say, that it was 'with a mere recognition of the worth of it, but with no 'belief' in it at all in *my sense* of the word belief—no belief but 'one definable as mere theoretic moonshine, which would never 'stand the wind and weather of fact.' What Mr. Carlyle's sense of 'belief' may be, we know not, and from his use of it in this book, it becomes still more puzzling; but at the time in question, Christian truths were to Sterling the objects of a faith, which showed itself by all that faith can show itself by. It is a new discovery, that it could not have existed, because it afterwards yielded to temptation. But sickness came, and leisure, and with it literary excitement, and the acquaintance—the friendship, of Mr. Carlyle; the talking, differing, sparring, fencing,—yet, 'except in opinions,' without disagreement. He began, as we have said, the clergyman. He ended, the literary man. 'By 'slow degrees the wrappings of his ecclesiastical life were unwinded from him; by laborious effort of detail, the fragments 'are picked off from him, and he is free of it in soul, as well as 'in title.' He began as a Christian; at his death, he had ceased to be one. He ended, in Mr. Carlyle's phrase, 'not as a sceptic'—'if you can understand it,'—not as 'a vanquished doubter, but 'as a victorious *believer* and *doer*;' which means, that 'out of the 'abysses of conflicting disbelief and sham-belief, and bedlam 'delusion now filling the world, he, like all men of reflection, 'had to seek out and shape a religion for himself.' He began in hope and sympathy. He went hence with the doctrine ringing in his ears, in every form of energetic scorn and savage merriment, that goodness and faith were dead among men; that, with the exception of a few 'honest fighters,' such as Mr. Carlyle,¹ fighting each their lonely and desperate battle, the whole generation with which he had lived in company, was one of impostors

¹ 'He sometimes spoke, with a certain zeal, of my starting a Periodical: Why not lift up some kind of war flag against the obese platitudes, and sickly superstitious apories and impostures of the time? But I had to answer, "Who will join it, my friend?" He seemed to say, "I, for one;" and there was occasionally a transient temptation in the thought, but transient only. No fighting regiment, with the smallest attempt towards drill, cooperation, commissariat, or the like unspeakable advantages, could be raised in Sterling's time or mine; which truly, *honest fighters, is a rather grievous want.* A grievous, but not quite a fatal one. r, failing this, failing all things and all men, there remains the solitary battle id were it by the poorest weapon, the tongue only, or were it even by wise abnence and silence, and without any weapon), such as each man for himself can age while he has life: an indubitable and infinitely comfortable fact for every nan!'—*Carlyle's Life of John Sterling*, p. 285.

or fools. 'I tread the common road,' he writes, in his last melancholy but touching letter to Carlyle—'I tread the common road into the great darkness, without any thought of fear, and with very much of hope. Certainty, indeed, I have none.'

'And so he played his part among us, and has now ended it: in this first half of the nineteenth century, such was the shape of human destinies the world and he made out between them. He sleeps now, in the little burying-ground of Bonchurch; bright, ever-young in the memory of others that must grow old; and was honourably released from his toils before the hottest of the day. . . .

'Like other such lives, like all lives, this is a tragedy: high hopes, noble efforts; under thickening difficulties and impediments, ever-new nobleness of valiant effort;—and the result death, with conquests by no means corresponding. A life which cannot challenge the world's attention; yet which does modestly solicit it, and perhaps on clear study will be found to reward it. . . .

'A man of infinite susceptibility; who caught everywhere, more than others, the colour of the element he lived in, the infection of all that was or appeared honourable, beautiful and manful in the tendencies of his time;—whose history therefore is, beyond others, emblematic of that of his Time.

'In Sterling's writings and actions, were they capable of being well read, we consider that there is for all true hearts, and especially for young noble seekers and strivers towards what is highest, a mirror in which some shadow of themselves and of their immeasurably complex arena will profitably present itself.'—Pp. 342, 343.

It is a bad look-out, indeed, for the Time, if its thinkers and workers, and 'honest fighters,' are only such as Mr. Sterling and Mr. Carlyle. Of Sterling we have nothing more to say. He may have been, according to his opportunities, a diligent and earnest inquirer after truth, though it was not given him to find it: the only proof that Mr. Carlyle gives us is, that he ardently pursued literature, and was drawn away by it from religion; and this is none at all. But Mr. Carlyle's claim to that title is becoming more questionable, every book that he writes; and this doubt arises, not from the conclusions to which he comes, but from the tone and spirit in which he speaks. Here is a man professing the most sacred reverence to truthfulness on the one hand, to earnestness and reality of mind and life on the other. Before his time, and widely spread, there has been a religion which has, eminently and without gainsaying, gathered to itself the flower of all excellence, in these later centuries of mankind; has been put to the proof by the truthful, and practically tried by the earnest, and has not failed them. And it still lasts and works: it is all round him, still believed in and trusted by truthful and earnest men. If it is not true, the light and hope of the world is put out: but, nevertheless, truth is truth—by wishing it, we cannot make a thing true that is not. But it is, at the first glance, a monstrous thing, that any man should touch on

such a contingency without feeling what he is doing; without showing that he is serious and knows what he is about. It is not bigotry, but the instinct of true feeling and common sense, which gives a summary judgment on any one who, in intermeddling with such tremendous interests, lets us discover those intellectual temptations, conceit, or pride, or gloom, or restlessness, or love of theory, which are as imperious over their victims as the coarser ones of sense, and if more subtle, are as real and as discernible. Into this position of seriously facing the question—and showing us that he is seriously facing it—whether, and how far Christian religion is what it is generally thought to be, Mr. Carlyle, while scornfully asking on all sides for earnestness and intelligible language, has, as far as can be seen, steadily declined to place himself. For every fact and principle that he has ever stated, its truth remains just as it was; but his writings go on the assumption that no man of sense and honesty believes it. Mr. Carlyle talks much of lies. It is on this lying assumption that he is now writing. Even he has not told us in so many words, what he ventures to disbelieve.

Mr. Carlyle has gained a great reputation for being a true-hearted and earnest man; unless it is absolutely impossible that he should be an impatient, a one-sided, an arrogant, a soured and querulous man, we see nothing to drive us to this belief. The invention of new words of sarcasm, and the applying them with pertinacity and keenness to the weak sides of all sides alike, is in itself a proof of no more than of a taste and a power for venting dislike and scorn. Many of the most vulgar-minded of our race have had the taste, at least, if they have not shared the power. And when Mr. Carlyle comes to the great questions on which the destiny of men and society hinges, he is, in substance, in his view and grasp of them—in spite of his power over detail and circumstance—as trivial, as cloudy, as unsatisfying, as destitute of any proof of powerful and solid thought, as the ordinary run of orators and scribblers, who furnish subjects for his sarcasm. Society has always been infested with imposture and sham. It is well to tell us so in sharp terms. But what more? Other phenomena it certainly has, equally striking and more attractive. What of them? True also, cant, and sham belief, and false belief, and innumerable confused forms of unreality and folly, float on the surface of religion, and overload the Church: so they have always done, and always will. It is no peculiarity of our days, evil though they be; and it is hard to imagine a poorer, or more vulgarly superficial view of religious history and belief than one which takes these accidents as the substance and core of them—the really important and significant portion of them. Yet this is the philosophy which pervades and regulates Mr. Carlyle's

writings. He will not trouble himself with *the whole state* of the facts. He dislikes, and he wants to teach others to dislike; and he does so by appealing to feelings which are just as bad as any that he attacks. He appeals, against society, against the Church, against Christianity, not to earnestness, but to that counterfeit of earnestness which can be as severe and bitter as possible in its easy-chair; and takes for its guarantee, that it is original and in advance of the time—not as other men are, slow and behind it. His way of teaching us earnestness is by every means in his power to produce the impression, that earnestness cannot have anything more to do with the religion, laws, institutions, people, to whom we certainly owe all that we have, and from whom we cannot, if we would, divorce our feelings and ourselves.

Voltaire attacked religion, not by contradicting it, but by mocking it. Mr. Carlyle does not contradict in words: he only brow-beats. It has outlived Voltaire. In a score of years, Mr. Carlyle will not be thought as formidable as Voltaire.

ART. VII.—*The Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints: a contemporary History, with Memoirs of the Life and Death of Joseph Smith, the 'American Mahomet.'* London: Office of the National Illustrated Library. 1851.

A PARALLEL between the obscure sect, which dates its rise from the imposture of Joseph Smith, and the mighty gathering of nations upon whom the word of the false prophet of Arabia has left its impress, will be censured by the majority of our readers, as an historical paradox put forward merely for the sake of catching the attention of those whose curiosity must be stimulated before they can be induced to reflect. For our justification in repeating such a parallel, we can make no better appeal than to the silent authority of the Geographer's lines. Let the inquirer look out a recent map of the North American continent, and cast his eye upon those territories of the Far West, which, within a few years, were unknown by name to Europeans, but are now as familiar to us as the provinces of France. The first to arrest his notice will be the indented coast-line of the modern El Dorado, with its creeks and mountain ranges, that are tempting so many wanderers to peril their lives in an unprofitable search for the metal by which other hoards than their own are to be enriched. Leaving the Californian territory, let him observe the Debateable Land of Oregon, the seedplot, as it was thought, of the great quarrel in which our Transatlantic rivals were to strive with their Anglo-Saxon kinsmen for preeminence among the nations of the earth. Returning to the south, he will range over the fair territory which American ambition and cupidity have lately wrested from the inertness of the Mexican rulers, who claimed to be descended from the energetic Conquerors of the New World. But the map has not yet been duly studied. Between Oregon and New Mexico, bounded by California on the west and Nebraska on the east, lies a wide and tempting region, deficient in no gifts of nature, already marked out as the highway to the gold mines of the west. This remarkable tract of country, the table-land from whence flow the waters that mingle with two oceans, yesterday was not even known by the wandering missionary, or named on the outline of the geographer. Now it is a sovereign State, formally admitted by Congress to the great confederacy of the Western World,¹ a constituent

¹ The latest accounts seem to render it doubtful whether this newly-gained privilege has satisfied the ambitious race to whom it was granted. There has been a movement in favour of absolute independence.

portion of that Union, whose astonishing progress in wealth and power outstrips the ability of our travellers to describe, and our statista to calculate. Utah (so the new State is named) has been reduced, indeed, by the act of Congress, from the limits which its ambitious inhabitants traced out for the boundary of their dominions. But it extends even now from the inhospitable steeps of the Sierra Nevada almost to the Rocky Mountains; and though it has been forbidden to claim a seaboard on the Pacific, it is probable that the energetic emigrants, who have rescued its plains from their pristine wildness, will not fail to keep some ready communication with the Old World nurseries of their enterprise under their own control. Already, it is said, the highway of the Mississippi, with its subsequent land journey of 1,000 miles, has been exchanged for the less difficult voyage round Cape Horn, or the transit of the Isthmus of Panama. By one route or another the stream of emigration flows on, and every year witnesses the deportation of our mechanics and labourers to the Valley of the Great Salt Lake, in numbers of which each return shows a marked and astonishing increase.

These emigrants are the Mormonites, for whose creed and undertakings men of letters in England feel no other sentiment than that of profound contempt. We are inclined to think that this feeling will hardly be justified by the testimony of facts. The creed, indeed, is contemptible enough; but the enterprise that has been accomplished by its believers will bear comparison with the most memorable expeditions in the history of the world. For that very reason it may be doubted whether the doctrine, too, may not be more worthy of attention than the first glance at its blasphemous follies might lead us to suppose. If it be not the cause or mainspring of the great movement, yet its coexistence with so much energy and perseverance redeems it from the imputation of mere puerile absurdity, which its dogmatic statements provoke. It may appear, perhaps, that Mormonism, in common with other impostures, has met a want of the age, and has called forth the homage of feelings, for which existing religions seemed to offer too narrow a field. Even its grossest errors may help us to understand the state of mind to which those errors approved themselves. Its falsehoods will remind us of the truths on which they border; while its evil practices and crimes, if such there be, may be a warning of the moral consequences to which all falsehood inevitably tends.

It has been observed of Mahometanism, that the corruptions of all existing religious systems, which it found on the scene of its first promulgation, were the favourable conditions of its birth. When Mahomet began to make known his claims, there was no real faith in Arabia. Each system had departed from its own

standard, and had ceased to retain a greater measure of respect than custom could ensure from the timid or careless inheritors of their fathers' delusions. At such a time the knowledge of a living truth was itself power. The firm resolve to bear testimony to such a truth implied an energy, with which the worn-out deference of slaves to corrupted traditions could not hope to compete. The unity of God was a fundamental verity which even such a man as Mahomet might well spend his life in vindicating, and which the mixture of countless errors, or the association of enormous vices, would be unable wholly to obscure.

The Mormon Prophet has no such justification of his imposture as the possession of that great truth gave to the author of the Koran. Yet his system, such as it is, bears witness to some important principles, with which the motley crowd of nineteenth-century sects has no acquaintance. We cannot wonder that the conventicles of England and America, often destitute of all ecclesiastical organization, with no better food than the fragments of an unsound theology, should furnish their thousands to a cause which had a real fraternity ready to receive them, and was not afraid of asserting its own claim to the possession of a divine revelation. We must add in sorrow, that we feel no surprise at the secessions from the Church itself of some votaries willing to accept the monstrous imposture of Joseph Smith. Whilst our nominal flocks number so many sheep to whom their own shepherds are unknown, so many believers who have not the remotest idea of the meaning of their own creed, it cannot be expected that any firm resistance should be offered on theological grounds to a new and imposing claim. A system which has cunningly availed itself of every suggestion which the successes or the failures of contending sects offered to the notice of its framers, has no great difficulty in the attempt to outbid them all in the contest for popular support.

It is our object to trace in a few leading particulars the nature of this remarkable success, and to point out the features which give to the victories of Mormonism a peculiar character among the records of religious fanaticism and error. This design does not require us to examine minutely into the pretended revelations and spiritual history of Joseph Smith. In the rise of Mormonism, as in the nobler movements of which history gives us any account, the original founder's work is not that which influences most largely the character of the whole system. Whatever may have been the real value of the Socratic philosophy, it is the light of Plato's genius which makes his master's name to shine so brightly after the lapse of two thousand years. Even with the different forms and communities in which, unhappily, Christianity has manifested itself, the same remark holds

good. Modern Romanism may trace its dogmatic establishment to the Council of Trent, but the brotherhood of Ignatius Loyola has given the tone to its war-note, and the energy by which its victories have been won. The Church in England owes more of good to the divines of the Caroline period, and more of evil to the Great Rebellion, than she could trace on either hand to her first Reformers. We must read the present by the light of the past. If it shocks some persons to meet with a comparison, even in an historical point of view, between the imposture of Mormonism and a branch of the Christian Church, we reply that we can only judge of a religious movement, whose votaries are said to have increased in twenty years from six to three hundred thousand, by comparing its conditions with those of other great spiritual revolutions. Such a comparison would lead us to expect that the men of power and genius, into whose hands the direction of the new religious system should fall subsequently to its first promulgation, would probably give its permanent character and regulation to the community rather than the bold speculator who first stumbled on the idea of its formation.

In fact, the question of the reality of Joseph Smith's revelations is not now a favourite subject with his disciples. The great majority simply accept the testimony offered to them without any disposition to criticise its value, or any patience to listen to the exposure of its absurdities. Relying on that argument from the inward evidence of conscience, which has been so much urged in the controversial appeals of our own seceders to Rome, they refuse to entertain sceptical objections, or to admit their force even when they are unanswerably maintained. The revelation, they say, satisfies their own moral necessities, and approves itself to their conscience; what more do they want? If they are pressed with arguments from Holy Scripture, they retort by an emphatic assertion of their own belief in its *literal* statements, and point out the many instances in which the literal meaning is denied by the creeds of their opponents. This kind of *argumentum ad hominem* is indeed used by them with no small skill on all occasions. Against the Protestant sects they triumphantly allege the disunion and uncertainty of their religious progress. The Church of England is questioned on account of its schismatical reformation, and the Roman communion for the ungodliness and false doctrine of the Papal See. Against all religious bodies in common the Mormonite charge is, that they lay claim to no present revelation, no abiding presence of Almighty God displayed in signs and wonders and spiritual gifts.

But the later writers who have advocated the cause are

elaborating a quasi-philosophical system, of which it is probable that Joseph Smith did not so much as form the conception. The most active and intelligent champion of the Mormonite scheme in England is a certain Orson Pratt, the author of various tracts, especially of an essay entitled the 'Absurdities of Immaterialism,' which supports a theory directly contradictory to our whole theological system. The first Article of our own Church, inherited from the Confessions of Apostolical Christendom, is treated with ridicule by the Mormon philosopher. On his theory the language of Holy Scripture, which describes the dealings of Almighty God with the human family in language intelligible to man, because borrowed from his nature, is no accommodation to our imperfect capacities, but the mere literal truth. The Almighty Creator is a material substance—the Three Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity, 'three distinct material substances, the same in kind, but not in identity.' These positions and the system deducible from them are not maintained in the tone of vulgar cant which characterises the symbolical books of Mormonism; they are set forth by a skilful reasoner, accustomed to reflect, and educated to appreciate the wisdom of the past. Warned by the absurdities into which some advocates of materialist doctrines have been betrayed, Orson Pratt guards himself from any share in their errors, and succeeds in constructing a system which, though it may shock the Christian and divert the philosopher, is yet plausible enough and sufficiently consistent in its parts to arrest the attention of the intellectual classes, for whom the coarse imposture of the Book of Mormon might offer no attraction. If such writings fulfil no other end than that of puzzling the imperfectly educated Christian, and rendering him dissatisfied with the community in which his lot has been cast, they do a valuable service to the writer's cause. When once doubt has passed into mistrust, and mistrust has engendered a painful sense of uncertainty about all religious truth, the apostle of a new faith has only to state his claim without hesitation and urge it without delay; the anxious doubter seizes the hand that is proffered to him in his struggle with the waters; any shore is welcome that will receive him out of the buffetings of that mental distress.

We refer to this class of writings partly to mark the rapid development of an intellectual system under circumstances that seemed to forbid all but the coarsest superstition, and at the same time to warn our readers against plunging into controversy with well-instructed Mormons under the mistaken idea that they will be sufficiently refuted by an exposure of the falsehoods or vices of their prophet. The Mormons will admit, perhaps, the possible truth of the charges, but they will turn round and inquire

whether the Bible contains no record of immoral men employed to fulfil God's promises ; and whether some of His chosen servants have not fallen into very grievous transgressions. Their prophet, they say, might have enjoyed divine revelations, and have been commissioned to perform God's work on earth, though his own career was not free from blemish. They will then readily shift their ground to their favourite subject, the coldness and shortcomings of the religious bodies which now divide the homage of the world, and thus clear the ground for the establishment of their new revelation in its full power and authority. With the more ignorant converts, of course, this array of argument is unnecessary : every one knows how easy it is by a few well-chosen subjects of censure to throw discredit on the established order of things, and how fair the character of a new religion may be made to appear in the eyes of the dissatisfied or restless. What that religion is, will appear from the Creed of the Latter-Day Saints, which we copy from a handbill before us, clearly printed on paper of a gorgeous hue, containing the exoteric doctrines of the disciples of Joseph Smith :—

'Latter-Day Saints' Faith.

'We believe in God the Eternal Father, and His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.

'We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgressions.

'We believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.

'We believe that these ordinances are :—1st. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.—2d. Repentance.—3d. Baptism by Immersion for the Remission of Sins.—4th. Laying on of hands for the Gift of the Holy Spirit.—5th. The Lord's Supper.

'We believe that men must be called of God by Inspiration, and by laying on of hands by those who are duly commissioned to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof.

'We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive Church :—viz., apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, &c.

'We believe in the powers and gifts of the everlasting Gospel :—viz., the gift of faith, discerning of spirits, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues, wisdom, charity, brotherly love, &c.

'We believe the word of God recorded in the Bible, we also believe the word of God recorded in the Book of Mormon, and in all other good books.

'We believe all that God has revealed, all that he does now reveal, and we believe that he will yet reveal many more great and important things, pertaining to the kingdom of God and Messiah's second coming.

'We believe in the literal gathering of Israel, and in the restoration of the ten tribes ; that Zion will be established upon the western continent, that Christ will reign personally upon the earth a thousand years, and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisaical glory.

'We believe in the literal resurrection of the body, and that the dead in Christ will rise first, and that the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years are expired.

'We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience unmolested, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how or where they may.

'We believe in being subject to kings, queens, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honouring, and sustaining the law.

'We believe in being honest, true, chaste, temperate, benevolent, virtuous, and upright, and in doing good to all men; indeed, we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul, we "believe all things," we "hope all things," we have endured very many things, and hope to be able to "endure all things." Every thing virtuous, lovely, praiseworthy, and of good report, we seek after, looking forward to the "recompense of reward."'

The first observation which the perusal of this confession of faith suggests, is the skilful use made of that popular reverence for the letter of Holy Scripture, which has survived almost every other kind of reverence among the members of Protestant sects. The phraseology of the Bible is carefully used, its inspiration admitted, and the Book of Mormon itself is allotted a subordinate place after the volume, whose supreme authority must be allowed in any appeal to the religious feelings of the Anglo-Saxon race. There seems good reason, however, to doubt whether this professed reverence is in practice maintained among the members whose loyalty may be relied upon, and whose services have been secured. Even in this confession of faith the inspiration of Scripture is shared with that of 'all other good books.' In the sermon which Mr. Caswall heard during his visit to Nauvoo,¹ the Mormonite preacher spoke of 'the old-fashioned book called the Bible, a book principally written in Asia by Jews, and suited to peculiar circumstances and peculiar classes.' Yet it is to be noticed that in this, as in similar attempts to depreciate Holy Scripture, the Mormons never attack its divine authority; their objection is only to its being made a *final* revelation. The Bible was a perfect authority for the times and the nations to whom it was given: these later times require, and receive, fresh communications of God's will by the mouths of His chosen servants. This apparent respect for the word of God secures the Mormon preacher a favourable hearing with many, in this country at least, who would turn a deaf ear to the direct promulgation in the first instance of unscriptural doctrine. They listen to a repetition of their favourite phrases delivered with all the unction of the conventicle, and when their sympathies are fairly enlisted, they are prepared to receive the new chapter in the book of divine revelation, which bears the prophetic authority of Joseph Smith.

But if the wisdom of those who framed the Mormonite

¹ 'The City of the Mormons: or three days at Nauvoo in 1842.' By the Rev. Henry Caswall, M.A. Author of 'America and the American Church.'

theology has been shown in their adherence to the phraseology of Holy Scripture, they have evinced still greater discernment in their selection of its contents. They have carefully noted the prophecies in the New Testament which shadow forth the tokens of the second advent of our Lord, and have boldly applied them to the circumstances of their own system with a facility for which its rapid extension and remarkable success seem in the eyes of the ignorant to afford a complete justification. At the same time they have hit the blot which deforms the whole aspect of popular Protestantism,—its denial of the present interference of Almighty God in the conduct of His Church. Eager to disprove the legendary miracles put forth by the Church of Rome, the modern school of divines has gone far to deny the possibility of miraculous agency altogether. They could not rest at this single step in their opposition to the doctrine of the Divine Providence, but were compelled, by an unhappy consistency, to contradict also the truth of that abiding presence of God, to which the Church bears witness in her sacramental system. They found it needful to draw an arbitrary line at a certain era, and to assume that the promises of divine help to the Church of Christ could have no fulfilment after the Apostolic age, but that thenceforward the relations of the Creator to His people were comprised in the simple diffusion of His written word. The Church has her own way of protesting against this modern phase of unbelief,—unbelief favoured (we must add) by her negligence in asserting the value of the gifts entrusted to her charge. But there have not been wanting other protests on the part of thoughtful speculators who saw the inconsistency between the popular view and many plain scriptural texts. The system popularly known as Irvingism, which numbers among its adherents not a few men of learning and ability, makes distinct assertion of the continuance of prophetic gifts amongst the Lord's people. An argument, parallel to that by which the Papal Infallibility is supported, is advanced in behalf of the probability that an inspired book would not be left in the world, without the assistance of inspired interpreters of its contents. Emanuel Swedenborg's name will readily occur to the thoughts of any one who has noticed the growth of modern religious systems, as an instance of the manner in which their founders have felt the necessity of ascribing their tenets to direct revelation. To enthusiastic spirits, the assumption that God never can interfere again for the direct announcement of His will is as intolerable in itself as it certainly has no warrant in the teaching of Holy Scripture. Of the way in which the Mormons take advantage of this practical unbelief among the sects around them, the follow-

ing hymn gives some idea. Its insertion may, perhaps, need some apology, but it is a characteristic specimen of the devotional poetry in vogue amongst the Mormon people.

- ' The God that others worship is not the God for me ;
He has no parts nor body, and cannot hear nor see ;
But I've a God that lives above—
A God of power and of love—
A God of revelation, oh ! that's the God for me ;
Oh ! that's the God for me ; oh ! that's the God for me.
- ' A church without apostles is not the church for me ;
It's like a ship dismasted afloat upon the sea ;
But I've a church that's always led
By the twelve stars around its head ;
A church with good foundations. Oh ! that's the church for me, &c.
- ' The hope that Gentiles cherish is not the hope for me ;
It has no hope for knowledge, far from it I would be ;
But I've an hope that will not fail,
That reaches safe within the veil ;
Which hope is like an anchor. Oh ! that's the hope, &c.
- ' The heaven of sectarians is not the heaven for me ;
So doubtful its location, neither on land nor sea ;
But I've an heaven on the earth,
The land and home that gave me birth ;
A heaven of light and knowledge. Oh ! that's the heaven, &c.
- ' A church without a gathering is not the church for me ;
The Saviour would not order it, whatever it might be ;
But I've a church that's called out
From false traditions, fear and doubt,
A gathering dispensation. Oh ! that's the church, &c.'

This hymn does not give a very high idea of the taste or reverence of Mormon poetry ; but it expresses in a popular way the nature of that comparison between the Church of the Latter-day Saints and the Protestant sects, by which the former is enabled to gain so many proselytes to its cause. It appeals at once to a principle of faith in the supernatural, to which the majority of mankind even in the nineteenth century are not insensible. It assumes an identity of operation for its own marvels with the work of the Spirit in other days, and claims to be heard with no greater prejudice against its divine authority than that which is felt on reading S. Paul's recital of the miraculous gifts bestowed on the Corinthian Church. Dr. Newman's argument for the miracles of Rome is urged with popular acceptance in behalf of the revelations of Joe Smith.

With Mormonism, as with the Roman claim, the question really resolves itself into an inquiry about the evidence alleged for the particular facts. In either case the *à priori* objections seem to us singularly unsafe to depend upon for confuting the believers in such facts. The absurdity of certain statements or transactions, — the illiterate vulgarity of their relators, —

the inadequacy of the objects for which the divine interference is alleged to have taken place; these, and the like objections, depend, it is clear, on the objector's view of what ought or ought not to be the character and purpose of a revelation from above. They may be urged, and have been urged again and again, by cavillers, against the miracles of Scripture with temporary success. Such arguments make no impression on the minds of men who have devoutly accepted the system in which the miracles appear; if the truth of the whole be admitted, it becomes a sin to doubt the value or reality of the parts. Nor, indeed, is it possible, under such conditions, to conduct any impartial inquiry into the evidence for particular facts. An inward persuasion takes the place of all argument, and vindicates for itself the creditable security of a saving faith. The state of mind in which such an imposture as Mormonism may be honestly, though not excusably, received, is illustrated by a conversation which Mr. Caswall relates to have occurred between himself and a Mormon doctor in the course of a ferry over the Mississippi. The physician was so earnest in his rhetoric that he forgot his duty as helmsman, and nearly frustrated the efforts of the boatmen to land himself and his companion on the wished-for strand.

'He said that the truth of Mormonism did not depend on the character of Smith or of any other man. That our Lord had told the Jews that there were other sheep, not of that fold, whom he intended to bring, and that in accordance with this declaration, after his ascension into heaven, he descended again in America, and preached the Gospel to the Indians, as the veracious history of the Book of Mormon assured us. That for his own part his faith had been produced solely by the power of God, and that if he was deceived, God Almighty had deceived him, and no other. "I was once an honest Atheist," he proceeded; "I felt that Christianity could not be true, since Christians have not yet decided among themselves what Christianity is. I was induced by curiosity to listen to the preaching of a Mormon elder. My attention was strongly arrested; I began to believe in God, and for many weeks and months was earnest in my prayer to Him for a knowledge of the truth. After the space of six months, I was one night lying awake in my bed meditating, when suddenly a conviction of the reality of the Christian religion flashed upon my mind like lightning. I saw the truth of the Scriptures and of the Book of Mormon. I felt powerfully convinced that the prophecies of Joseph Smith were from God. At the same time, I was filled with a supernatural ecstasy which resembled heaven itself. I could not restrain my feelings, but cried out, 'O my God, if it be thus to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, what must it be to be baptized with fire!' From that time I have been a member of the 'Latter Day Church,' and, believe me, I would rather be an honest Atheist again, than embrace the doctrines of any of the sects. If the religion which I profess be false, there is no true religion upon earth!'"

No process of argument can resist such a conviction as this. The very fact of the man's conversion becomes to him an evidence of its propriety, and a denial of the doctrine which he has

embraced is no less than a thankless repudiation of the grace of God vouchsafed to his soul.

And yet to unfriendly inquirers it is an amazing thing to see how absolutely baseless is the presumed theory of inspiration, for which the exercise of this unreasoning faith is required. Inquiry was made at so early a period into the claims of the new religion, that the materials for its composition can be at once identified. Its ecclesiastical parent was the Campbellite sect, which prevailed at the time through a large portion of the United States. From this once popular heresy,—a modification of the Baptist sect,—the Mormonite creed borrowed its ‘baptism by immersion for the remission of sins,’ and other of its leading doctrines. Sidney Rigdon, a Campbellite preacher, superior in learning and address to the prophet himself, appears to have given order and consistency to Smith’s revelations by a communication of the knowledge acquired in his own profession. From the same source came the idea of an ecclesiastical government by apostles, elders, bishops, &c., founded on a literal adoption of scriptural terms, which proved to be so great an attraction to converts, and so useful in directing the energies of the infant society. The Book of Mormon itself was identified in its style and general contents with a work of fiction composed by one Solomon Spaulding—composed, as it seems, rather as a literary proslution than with any dishonest purpose—in the beginning of the present century, of which the manuscript was clandestinely removed from his literary remains. This work had been designed to illustrate a favourite theory of the migration of the lost Jewish tribes to America—a theory which, it is well known, has been held to possess no inconsiderable amount of probability by learned and candid inquirers. This notion Smith adopted almost in the words of Mr. Spaulding, and made the predictions of the romance a groundwork for his own revelations. Its history, not altogether free from anachronisms and other mistakes, he put forth as the genuine account of a Jewish race, whose ancestor left Jerusalem in the reign of Zedekiah, because of the wickedness of the city. His story and that of his family, including their migration under Divine direction to America, are continued down to the end of the fourth century of the Christian era, when the whole race was exterminated, and their sacred books buried in the earth, to be discovered after 1,600 years by Joseph Smith, and by him explained to mankind through the immediate power of God. A still more important work was ‘The Book of Covenants and Revelations,’ containing, in the form of Divine announcements, the various directions for the establishment of Smith’s power, and the arrangements which from time to time it was his policy to effect amongst his followers. It was with reference to this, perhaps, that he com-

pared himself to Mahomet; in both cases, certainly, the revelations were marvellously convenient to their supposed recipients; it may well be matter of surprise that in America, as in Arabia, men should have so readily accepted as divine truths pretensions which harmonized with the longings of human passion, and the necessities of worldly policy.

Thus far, then, it appears from internal evidence what were the favourable conditions of the first preaching of Mormonism. It adopted from existing religions its respect for the letter of Holy Scripture, while it brought forward from that treasury doctrines neglected by the sectarian teachers; it appealed, amongst the educated, to the Christian principle of faith,— amongst the ignorant to the natural love of the new and marvellous which has nowhere received a more vigorous development than in America; above all, it held out in its imposing organization and lofty claims, a hope of that certainty which is so grateful to the perplexed enthusiast, and that guidance which, under one shape or another, most men will prefer to the trouble of choosing their own path by the light which God has granted to them.

But Mormonism has to thank its enemies for its great success. It is an old remark, that persecution is necessary for the real advancement of any great spiritual cause; but the persecution to which the Latter-Day Saints have been subjected, has been in a peculiar degree the occasion of calling out the energy of their system, and setting it free from the trammels imposed by its equivocal origin. If it had effected no more than the removal of the founders of the society from scenes where their character was in ill repute, it would have been a great advantage. In the states of Vermont or New York, Smith was known as a member of a disreputable family, himself engaged in discreditable speculations, and preferring a precarious support from the credulity of money-diggers to any honest industry. In the Far West his prophetic claims were not liable to the injurious imputations which these associations involved, and perhaps his own powers were more freely exerted when he felt himself to be beyond the reach of such inconvenient criticism. Moreover, the labours and perils of the persecuted Mormonites constituted in themselves a fulfilment of prophecy, and a proof of Divine aid. No miracle which fanatics could invent would have been a more powerful argument than the repeated renewal of prosperity after cruel reverses, and the rapid recovery from what seemed to have been utter extinction. Qualities, too, were brought out under the pressure of misfortune which would have dignified any society. While the lukewarm deserted the sinking cause, the remnant were drawn together in a brotherly

union, giving occasion for acts of fortitude and endurance, of which Christians may blush to read. Nor must it be overlooked, that the isolation of the Mormonites, caused by repeated persecutions, gave them the opportunity of developing their organization with a completeness which would have been impossible in the midst of older institutions and regular authorities.

There is, indeed, something not a little remarkable in the violent opposition with which Smith and his followers were so repeatedly assailed. In a country where all religions are equal, and every variety of belief flourishes in so much luxuriance, it seems strange that the Mormonites should have been perpetually attacked, whilst, at the same time, they were winning a constant increase of support. Perhaps this very success may have moved the envy of the rival denominations, from whom their proselytes were gained, and whose endless divisions, justified by the exaggerated doctrine of private judgment, which they preached, could never compete with the well-arranged and compact order of the Church of the Latter-Day Saints. Of the reality of the crimes laid to their charge by the authors of these persecutions, it is very difficult to speak with any degree of certainty. It is as unlikely that their misdemeanours could have been such as to excuse the outrages committed in Missouri and Illinois, as that their present abode should be the Utopia of virtuous innocence which some recent travellers describe. The enmity of which they have been the objects, may, perhaps, receive some illustration from the parallel animosity against the Jesuits in the old continent. The American mob, like the royal and aristocratical authorities of Europe, were displeased to find an *imperium in imperio*, governed by influences which they could not control, interfering in popular elections, and threatening, at no distant period, to become the rulers of the land.

From the very first institution of his 'Church,' Joseph Smith met with reproaches and affronts. In the villages of Western New York, where his family were known, the people insulted him, and broke down a dam, which he had made across a stream of water for the purpose of baptizing his disciples. In Ohio, he met with the same opposition. At Kirtland, in that State, were the first indications of his future amazing success. The society which he founded there in 1830, and which received under the influence of Sidney Rigdon the first infusion of systematized Mormonism, rapidly numbered its hundreds of believers, and excited the jealousy of the whole country. But his most ferocious assailants were the people of Jackson County, in the State of Missouri, where he founded the Mormonite colony of Zion. The 'Bishop' of this place was *tarred and feathered* by the mob, houses were pulled down, and men flogged

so severely as to cause their death. Hundreds were compelled to fly with wives and families from possessions which their enemies seized or destroyed. So hasty was their flight, that 200 women and children spent a night on the naked prairie in the cold and rain, while they waited for the means of crossing the Missouri river. Again, in Clay County, a part of the same State, after a four years' sojourn, during which their industry and energy had produced a remarkable increase of wealth and numbers, their aggressive power provoked a fierce retaliation. The militia and the authorities were against them, determined to second the popular cry for their expulsion. The massacre at Haun's Mill, in which a Mormon child of nine years old was shot in cold blood by the assailants, occupies a terrible prominence among the records of their expulsion from the whole territory of Missouri.

After incredible hardships in the winter of 1830, fifteen thousand Mormons found a home in Illinois. Their city of Nauvoo, on the banks of the Mississippi, soon became famous throughout America. Their temple, of which the foundation-stone was laid in 1841 with a magnificent ceremonial, was said to be the finest building in the United States. They had a well-appointed legion of troops, a university, and a brilliant staff of civil and military authorities. Yet from this place too they were expelled, with circumstances of still greater misery and contempt, by a popular movement, aided by the whole executive of the State. It was after the tragical death of the prophet himself, who was shot by a mob, when the doors of the prison in which he was confined had been broken open, that this final expulsion of the Mormons from the Eastern States of America occurred. The whole relation has the interest of a romance, and will well repay the perusal of those who think that the nineteenth century can furnish no parallel to the civil wars and national migrations of classical or mediæval times. We cannot resist making an extract from the spirited, though somewhat highly-coloured, account of Colonel Kane, who was a companion of the march which the expelled community made from their ruined city in Illinois to their new home in the wild districts beyond the Rocky Mountains. This is the commencement of his narrative:—

'A few years ago, ascending the Upper Mississippi in the autumn, when its waters were low, I was compelled to travel by land past the regions of the Rapids. My road lay through the Half-Breed-Tract, a fine section of Iowa, which the unsettled state of its land-titles had appropriated as a sanctuary for coiners, horse thieves, and other outlaws. I had left my steamer at Keokuk, at the foot of the Lower Fall, to hire a carriage, and to contend for some fragments of dirty meal with the swarming flies, the only scavengers of the locality. From this place to where the deep water of the

river returns, my eye wearied to see everywhere sordid, vagabond, and idle settlers; and a country marred, without being improved by their careless hands.

'I was descending the last hill-side upon my journey, when a landscape in delightful contrast broke upon my view. Half encircled by a bend of the river, a beautiful city lay glittering in the fresh morning sun; its bright new dwellings, set in cool green gardens, ranging up around a stately dome-shaped hill, which was crowned by a noble marble edifice, whose high tapering spire was radiant with white and gold. The city appeared to cover several miles; and beyond it, in the background, there rolled off a fair country, chequered by the careful lines of fruitful husbandry. The unmistakeable marks of industry, enterprise, and educated wealth everywhere, made the scene one of singular and most striking beauty.

'It was a natural impulse to visit this inviting region. I procured a skiff, and rowing across the river, landed at the chief wharf of the city. No one met me there. I looked, and saw no one. I could hear no one move; though the quiet everywhere was such, that I heard the flies buzz, and the water-ripples break against the shallow of the beach. I walked through the solitary streets. The town lay as in a dream, under some deadening spell of loneliness, from which I almost feared to wake it; for plainly it had not slept long. There was no grass growing up in the paved ways; rains had not entirely washed away the prints of dusty footsteps.

'Yet I went about unchecked. I went into empty workshops, rope-walks, and smithies. The spinner's wheel was idle; the carpenter had gone from his work-bench and shavings, his unfurnished sash and casing. Fresh bark was in the tanner's vat, and the fresh-chopped lightwood stood piled against the baker's oven. The blacksmith's shop was cold; but his coal heap, and ladling pool, and crooked water-horn, were all there, as if he had just gone off for a holiday. No work-people anywhere looked to know my errand. If I went into the gardens, clinking the wicket latch loudly after me, to pull the marygolds, heart'sease, and lady-slippers, and draw a drink with the water-sodden well-bucket and its noisy chain; or, knocking off with my stick the tall heavy-headed dahlias and sunflowers, hunted over the beds for cucumbers and love apples,—no one called out to me from any opened window, or dog sprang forward to bark an alarm. I could have supposed the people hidden in the houses, but the doors were unfastened; and when at last I timidly entered them, I found dead ashes white upon the hearths, and had to tread a-tiptoe, as if walking down the aisle of a country church, to avoid rousing irreverent echoes from the naked floors.

'On the outskirts of the town was the city graveyard; but there was no record of plague there, nor did it in anywise differ much from other Protestant American cemeteries. Some of the mounds were not long sodded; some of the stones were newly set, their dates recent, and their black inscriptions glossy in the mason's hardly dried lettering ink. Beyond the graveyard, out of the fields, I saw, in one spot hard by where the fruited boughs of a young orchard had been roughly torn down, the still smouldering remains of a barbecue fire, that had been constructed of rails from the fencing round it. It was the latest sign of life there. Fields upon fields of heavy-headed yellow grain lay rotting ungathered upon the ground. No one was at hand to take in their rich harvest. As far as the eye could reach, they stretched away—they sleeping too in the hazy air of autumn.

'Only two portions of the city seemed to suggest the import of this mysterious solitude. On the southern suburb the houses looking out upon the country showed, by their splintered wood-work and walls battered to the foundation, that they had lately been the mark of a destructive cannonade.

And in and around the splendid Temple, which had been the chief object of my admiration, armed men were barracked, surrounded by their stacks of musketry and pieces of heavy ordnance. These challenged me to render an account of myself, and why I had had the temerity to cross the water without a written permit from the leader of their band. Though these men were generally more or less under the influence of ardent spirits, after I had explained myself as a passing stranger, they seemed anxious to gain my good opinion. They told me the story of the Dead City; that it had been a notable manufacturing and commercial mart, sheltering over 20,000 persons; that they had waged war with its inhabitants for several years; and had been finally successful only a few days before my visit, in an action fought in front of the ruined suburb; after which, they had driven them forth at the point of the sword. The defence, they said, had been obstinate, but gave way on the third day's bombardment. They boasted greatly of their prowess, especially in this battle, as they called it; but I discovered they were not of one mind as to certain of the exploits that had distinguished it; one of which, as I remember, was, that they had slain a father and his son, a boy of fifteen, not long residents of the fated city, whom they admitted to have borne a character without reproach. They also conducted me inside the massive sculptured walls of the curious Temple, in which they said the banished inhabitants were accustomed to celebrate the mystic rites of an unhallowed worship. They particularly pointed out to me certain features of the building, which, having been the peculiar objects of a former superstitious regard, they had, as matter of duty, sedulously defiled and defaced. The reputed sites of certain shrines they had thus particularly noticed; and various sheltered chambers, in one of which was a deep well, constructed, they believed, with a terrible design. Beside these, they led me to see a large and deep chiselled marble vase or basin, supported upon twelve oxen, also of marble, and of the size of life, of which they told some romantic stories. They said the deluded persons, most of whom were emigrants from a great distance, believed their Deity countenanced their reception here of a baptism of regeneration, as proxies for whomsoever they held in warm affection in the countries from which they had come. That here parents 'went into the water' for their lost children, children for their parents, widows for their spouses, and young persons for their lovers: that thus the Great Vase came to be for them associated with all dear and distant memories, and was therefore the object, of all others in the building, to which they attached the greatest degree of idolatrous affection. On this account, the victors had so diligently desecrated it, as to render the apartment in which it was contained too noisome to abide in. They permitted me also to ascend into the steeple, to see where it had been lightning-struck on the Sabbath before; and to look out east and south, on wasted farms like those I had seen near the city, extending till they were lost in the distance. Here in the face of pure day, close to the scar of the Divine wrath left by the thunderbolt, were fragments of food, cruises of liquor, and broken drinking vessels, with a brass drum and a steam-boat signal bell, of which I afterwards learned the use with pain.

'It was after nightfall when I was ready to cross the river on my return. The wind had freshened since the sunset, and the water beating roughly into my little boat, I hedged higher up the stream than the point I had left in the morning, and landed where a faint glimmering light invited me to steer.

'Here, among the dock and rushes, sheltered only by darkness, without a roof between them and the sky, I came upon a crowd of several hundred human creatures, whom my movements roused from uneasy slumber on the ground.

'Passing these on my way to the light, I found it came from a tallow

candle in a paper funnel shade, such as is used by street-vendors of apples and pea-nuts, and which, flaming and guttering away in the bleak air off the water, shone flickeringly on the emaciated features of a man in the last stage of a bilious remittent fever. They had done their best for him. Over his head was something like a tent made of a sheet or two, and he rested on a but partially ripped-open old straw mattress, with a hair sofa-cushion under his head for a pillow. His gaping jaw and glazing eye told how short a time he would monopolize these luxuries; though a seemingly bewildered and excited person, who might have been his wife, seemed to find hope in occasionally forcing him to swallow awkwardly sips of the tepid river water, from a burned and battered bitter-smelling tin coffee-pot. Those who knew better had furnished the apothecary he needed,—a toothless old baldhead, whose manner had the repulsive dulness of a man familiar with death-scenes. He, so long as I remained, mumbled in his patient's ear a monotonous and melancholy prayer, between the pauses of which I heard the hiccup and sobbing of two little girls, who were sitting upon a piece of drift-wood outside.

‘Dreadful, indeed, was the suffering of these forsaken beings; bowed and cramped by cold and sun-burn, alternating as each weary day and night dragged on, they were almost all of them the crippled victims of disease. They were there because they had no homes, nor hospital, nor poor-house, nor friends to offer them any. They could not satisfy the feeble cravings of their sick: they had not bread to quiet the fractious hunger-cries of their children. Mothers and babes, daughters and grandparents, all of them alike were bivouacked in tatters, wanting even covering to comfort those whom the sick shiver of fever was searching to the marrow.

‘These were Mormons, in Lee County, Iowa, in the fourth week of the month of September, in the year of our Lord 1846. The city—it was Nauvoo, Illinois. The Mormons were the owners of that city, and the smiling country round. And those who had stopped their ploughs, who had silenced their hammers, their axes, their shuttles, and their workshop-wheels,—those who had put out their fire, who had eaten their food, spoiled their orchards, and trampled under foot their thousands of acres of unharvested bread,—these were the keepers of their dwellings, the carousers in their temple, whose drunken riot insulted the ears of the dying.

‘I think it was as I turned from the wretched night-watch of which I have spoken, that I first listened to the sounds of revel of a party of the guard within the city. Above the distant hum of the voices of many, occasionally rose distinct the loud oath-tainted exclamation, and the falsely intonated scrap of vulgar song: but lest this requiem should go unheeded, every now and then, when their boisterous orgies strove to attain a sort of ecstatic climax, a cruel spirit of insulting frolic carried some of them up into the high belfry of the temple-steeple, and there, with the wicked childishness of inebriates, they whooped and shrieked, and beat the drum that I had seen, and rung, in charivariic unison, their loud-tongued steam-boat bell.

‘They were all told,—not more than six hundred and forty persons, who were thus lying on the river flats. But the Mormons in Nauvoo and its dependencies had been numbered the year before at over twenty thousand. Where were they? They had last been seen carrying in mournful train their sick and wounded, halt and blind, to disappear behind the western horizon, pursuing the phantom of another home. Hardly anything else was known of them: and people asked with curiosity, “What had been their fate—what their fortunes?”’

The narrative of which we have now quoted the commencement, was read before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in the spring of 1850. A second edition was soon called for, which contained some remarks on the charges made against the Mormons of dishonesty and sensuality: we shall have occasion to refer to them presently. The discourse itself is exceedingly valuable, as the testimony of an eye-witness to the particulars of one of the most extraordinary pilgrimages recorded in the history of the world. Colonel Kane accompanied the main expedition, and has related the facts of its progress with the glowing enthusiasm of a pilgrim's experience. Of the truth of his account in its main circumstances we see no reason to doubt.

The populace in Illinois had for some time manifested a similar temper to that which had been previously displayed in Missouri with such melancholy results. The murder of Joseph Smith was felt to have made the breach irreparable; and an assembly of delegates from nine counties demanded the expulsion of the 'Saints' from the State, in which their power and pretensions provoked such deadly animosity. The citizens of Nauvoo, after much controversy, and after manifestations of implacable severity on the part of the mob, agreed to depart from their beautiful city, to leave the territory which they had reclaimed and the wealth they had accumulated for a distant home in the unknown region of the Great Salt Lake beyond the Rocky Mountains. A company of pioneers, the most vigorous and active of their society, went forward to mark the way: the property and persons of the remaining body were to be respected during the interval which must elapse before they could follow. These pioneers set out—some of them crossed the Mississippi on the ice—in February 1846, and commenced their march over the prairie, ill prepared to face the perils of that tremendous journey. Their line was marked by the graves of the sufferers, who fell victims to the cold and rain, which impeded their march and crippled their energies through the dreary months of that inclement winter and the still more fatal spring which followed it. Two circumstances brought unlooked-for hindrance to the expedition. The one was a demand from the government of the United States of a contingent of troops for the Mexican war, with which in the midst of their troubles they notwithstanding complied;—the other and more disastrous calamity was the intelligence of the treachery of their old enemies in Illinois, provoked, perhaps, by the 'consecration' of the Nauvoo temple, which had led to a general onslaught of the armed multitude and the ruthless extermination or expulsion of the dwellers in the 'Holy City.' The people of Iowa were

amazed to see the stream of emigrants passing westward like an endless procession, with their wagons and ox-teams, their families and all the property they could save from the wreck, on what seemed a hopeless journey—the Californian road was not then explored—to the unknown wilderness. The constant arrivals of these stragglers, often in a state of destitution and helplessness, retarded the march of the more active companies, who could not leave their brethren to die in the prairie, and whose energies were tasked to provide food and shelter for the gathering multitude. It was this which compelled the pilgrim horde to winter amongst the Indian tribes at the close of the year 1846; it was not until the autumn of the following year that the advanced guard issued from the perilous defiles of the Rocky Mountains to occupy the plain of Deseret: in 1848 they were joined by the last remnant from inhospitable Missouri. The details of the journey, ‘the desert march, the ford, the quicksand, the Indian battle, the bison chase, the prairie fire,’ are sketched by Colonel Kane, their adventurous partaker, with all a traveller’s zest. The descriptions of their encampments in the wilderness derive a peculiar interest from the remarkable discipline—and that, too, under religious sanctions—which pervaded their host in spite of its hardships and the numberless divisions in which it was of necessity dispersed. Add to this the mechanical proficiency and experience of the travellers,—the Mormon gunsmith would turn out a neatly-finished rifle, working in the prairie with the grass above his shoulders,—and a picture of national migration is presented to us, for which we know no parallel in history.

The feature in Colonel Kane’s narrative, which, next to its romantic detail of peril and endurance, arrests the reader’s attention, is his warm admiration of the moral character of the Mormon multitude. This view is directly opposed to the notion prevalent in the United States; it is contradictory of the evidence given by Mr. Caswall, after his visit to Nauvoo in 1842; and it is at variance with the expectation which Christians would naturally form of the results to be produced by a fanatical imposture like the system of Joseph Smith. It seems but fair to give the writer’s own explanation of this discrepancy. We quote from a Mormon publication, ‘*The Millennial Star*,’ a postscript to the second edition of Colonel Kane’s discourse:—

‘I have been annoyed by comments this hastily written discourse has elicited: well-meaning friends have even invited me to tone down its remarks in favour of the Mormons, for the purpose of securing them a readier acceptance. I can only make them more express. The truth must take care of itself. I not only meant to deny that the Mormons in anywise

fall below our own standard of morals, but would be distinctly understood to ascribe to those of their number with whom I associated in the West, a general correctness of deportment and purity of character above the average of ordinary communities. The furthest I can go towards qualifying my testimony will be to name the causes to which, as a believer in nature's compensations, I have myself credited this undue morality.

'It was partly attributable, perhaps, to their forced abstemiousness. . . . Some influence should be referred also to their custom, of early and equal marriages, these not being regulated by the prudential considerations which embarrass opulent communities; something more to the supervision which was incidental to their nomadic life, and the habits it encouraged of disciplined but grateful industry.

'The chief cause, however, was probably found in this fact. The Mormons, as I saw them, though a majority, were but a portion of the Church as it flourished in Illinois. When the persecution triumphed there, and no alternative remained for the steadfast in the faith but the flight out of Egypt into the wilderness, as it was termed, all their fair-weather friends forsook them. Priests and elders, scribes and preachers, deserted by whole counsels at a time; each talented knave, of whose craft they had been victims, finding his own pretext for abandoning them, without surrendering the money bag of which he was the holder. One of these, for instance, bore with him so considerable a congregation that he was able to found quite a thriving community in Northern Wisconsin, which I believe he afterwards transplanted entire to an island in one of the Lakes. . . . Quite recently an abandoned clergyman, who shortly before the Exod was excommunicated for his improper conduct, has presented a memorial to Congress, in which he charges the Mormons with very much more than he himself appears to have been guilty of. . . . So the Mormons have been, as it were, *broken and screened* by calamity. Their designing leaders have left them, to seek fairer fortunes elsewhere. Those that remain of the old rock are the masses, always honest in the main, and sincere even in delusion; and their guides are a few tried and trusty men, little initiated in the plotting of synagogues, and more noted by services rendered than bounties received. They are the men whom I saw on the prairie trail, sharing sorrow with the sorrowful and poverty with the poor;—the chief of them all, a man of rare natural endowment, to whose masterly guidance they are mainly indebted for their present prosperity, driving his own ox-team and carrying his sick child in his arms.¹

'The fact explains itself that those only were willing to undertake their fearful pilgrimage of penance whom a sense of conscientious duty made willing to give up the world for their religion. The Mormons, I knew, were all, as far as I could judge, partakers of the sacrament, persons of prayer and faith; and their contentment, their temperance, their heroism, their strivings after that golden age of Christian brotherhood, were but the manifestations of their ever-present and engrossing devotional feeling.'

But whatever be the judgment of candid inquirers as to the moral and social bearings of Mormonism, it is plain that as an emigration movement it will continue to exercise great influence. In the present state of England many a family will be allured by the hope of a home in the Far West, where mechanical skill will be appreciated, and honest industry encouraged;

¹ This was Brigham Young, the choice of the Mormons for Governor of Deseret.

who would care neither for the 'Book of Covenants,' nor for the speculations of a materialist philosophy. The Saints were said last year to have set aside from the profits of their husbandry, or of the Californian diggings—for there are gold-hunters too in the Latter-Day Church—94,080 ounces of gold for the purpose of gathering the poor saints from England and other parts of Europe, as well as from the remote districts of the American Union, into the Great Salt Lake Valley. Their accommodation for emigrants is carefully provided, and order maintained on the voyage. When they reach the Mormon territory, they find no such difficulties as beset the unfortunate crowds who are 'shovelled out' on other parts of the American continent. What wonder if their emigration agency commands a steady success, and makes proselytes of those to whose faith so tempting a Canaan is proposed?

At the Conference publicly held in London, in June, details were given of the success of the 'elders' in their various missions. In the metropolis¹ itself there appear to be about 3,000 members of this strange society. There is scarcely a town, where a branch has not been established, or a district where Mormonite tracts do not circulate. And this is the time when we are told that where the Bible is known, there cannot be error; this is the age in which the narrow-minded blindness of a 'Lydian' clique would abolish the last ties that bind men to the Church of their fathers, and destroy the one society, whereby it has pleased Almighty God to save His elect from the false Christs and false prophets, whose lying wonders should deceive so many in the last days of the world!

¹ 'THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS was organized on the 6th day of April, 1830, with six members in North America. On the 18th of July, 1837, several elders landed in Liverpool—without friends, wealth, or influence; and after the labour of about eight months, 700 members met in conference, at or near Preston; continual accessions were made,—that in 1840, there were 4,019 members in England. In the same year (1840), three elders first introduced the Gospel into London,—they wandered about the metropolis for about thirty days, before they found any one willing to receive the heavenly message: after six months' labour, they succeeded in establishing a small branch of the Church.

* THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS WILL SHOW THE PROGRESS OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE, FROM THE YEAR 1845.

Date.	Members.	Elders.	Priests.	Teachers.	Deacons.	Baptized.
December 1845.....	321	13	16	8	7	69
" 1846.....	342	13	20	6	7	42
June 1847.....	477	28	22	11	10	102
February 1848.....	699	51	43	16	12	246
December 1848.....	1,230	58	62	23	18	317
" 1849.....	2,637	88	113	64	41	767
June 1850.....	2,529	102	118	72	47	595
December 1850.....	2,990	123	142	96	64	753

¹ 'The number of Saints in the British Isles, December 1850, 30,747. The number of Saints in the world, above 300,000.'

ART. VIII.—*The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World; from Marathon to Waterloo.* By E. S. CREASY, M.A. *Professor of Ancient and Modern History in University College, London, late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.* 2 vols. London: Bentley. 1851.

MR. HALLAM, reviewing Charles Martel's victory over the Saracens, has said in a note, that it 'may justly be reckoned among 'those few battles of which a contrary event would have essentially varied the drama of the world in all its subsequent scenes; 'with Marathon, Arbela, the Metaurus, Châlons, and Leipsic.'¹ This suggestive note first led Professor Creasy, as he informs us in his preface, to consider the subject of the 'Decisive Battles of the World.' He has selected *fifteen*. For the battle of Leipsic, named by Mr. Hallam,—the battle which in 1813 drove the French out of Germany, as that of Vittoria in the same year expelled them from Spain,—Professor Creasy substitutes the Battle of Waterloo. Without insisting upon the absolute correctness of his selection, he justifies it in the following terms:—

'The encounters between the Greeks and Persians which followed Marathon, seem to me not to have been phenomena of primary impulse. Greek superiority had been already asserted, Asiatic ambition had been already checked, before Salamis and Plataea confirmed the superiority of European free states over oriental despotism. So, Ægos-Potamos, which finally crushed the maritime power of Athens, seems to me inferior in interest to the defeat before Syracuse, where Athens received her first fatal check, and after which she only struggled to retard her downfall. I think similarly of Zama with respect to Carthage, as compared with the Metaurus: and, on the same principle, the subsequent great battles of the Revolutionary War appear to me inferior in their importance to Valmy, which first determined the military character and career of the French Revolution.'—*Pref.* p. viii.

We shall pass, without note or comment, over the later battles selected by Mr. Creasy:—the Battle of Hastings, Joan of Arc at Orleans, the Defeat of the Spanish Armada, the Battle of Blenheim, the Battle of Pultowa, the Victory of the Americans over the English at Saratoga, the Battle of Valmy, and the crowning victory of Waterloo. We shall confine ourselves to the Battles of Marathon, Syracuse, Arbela, and the Metaurus, the victory of Arminius, and the Battles of Châlons and Tours.

'Two thousand three hundred and forty years ago, a council of Athenian officers was summoned on the slope of one of the mountains that look over

¹ 'Europe during the Middle Ages,' vol. i. p. 5.

the plain of Marathon, on the eastern coast of Attica. On the result of their deliberation depended not merely the fate of two armies, but the whole future progress of human civilization.'—Vol. i. p. 1.

Of the four universal monarchies of the ancient world, Babylon having disappeared, that empire of which Cyrus laid the sure foundation when he conquered Cræsus and subdued Lydia—that empire which Cambyses afterwards built up—was enlarged by the Indian and Arabian conquests of the Darawesh Gushtâsp¹ into a sovereignty of all but unlimited extent and absolute control. And now this vast empire—akin to the preceding twin monarchies of Asia that had been enthroned at Nineveh and Babylon,—looming in the twilight of primeval history—dim and indistinct, massive and majestic, like a lofty mountain in the early dawn,—cast its huge shadow westward, and darkened over Greece.

'The Greeks, from their geographical position, formed the natural vanguard of European liberty against Persian ambition; and they pre-eminently displayed those salient points of distinctive national character, which have rendered European civilization so far superior to Asiatic . . .

'Versatile, enterprising, and self-confident, the Greeks presented the most striking contrast to the habitual quietude and submissiveness of the Orientals. And, of all the Greeks, the Athenians exhibited the national characteristics in the strongest degree.'—Vol. i. pp. 22—24.

Into their hands was now entrusted, by Divine Providence, the key of temporal empire, to open or to shut the door of Europe on the invading East. If Athens had then fallen, no other Greek state, except Lacedæmon, would have had the courage to resist; and Lacedæmon, like her Leonidas with his three hundred at Thermopylæ, could but have resisted unto the death and then perished at the pass.

'Nor was there any power to the westward of Greece that could have offered an effectual opposition to Persia, had she once conquered Greece, and made that country a basis for future military operations. Rome was at this time in her season of utmost weakness. Her dynasty of powerful Etruscan kings had been driven out; and her infant commonwealth was reeling under the attacks of the Etruscans and Volscians from without, and the fierce dissensions between the patricians and plebeians within. Etruria, with her Lucumos and serfs, was no match for Persia. Samnium had not grown into the might which she afterwards put forth: nor could the Greek colonies in South Italy and Sicily hope to conquer when their parent states had perished. Carthage had escaped the Persian yoke in the time of Cambyses, through the reluctance of the Phœnician mariners to serve against their kinsmen. But such forbearance could not long have been relied on; and the future rival of Rome would have become as submissive a minister of the Persian power as were the Phœnician cities themselves.

'If we turn to Spain, or if we pass the great mountain-chain, which, pronged through the Pyrenees, the Cevennes, the Alps, and the Balkan,

¹ Darius Hystaspes.

divides Northern from Southern Europe, we shall find nothing at that period but mere savage Finns, Celts, Slaves, and Teutons. Had Persia beaten Athens at Marathon, she could have found no obstacle to prevent Darius, the chosen servant of Ormuzd, from advancing his sway over all the known western races of mankind. The infant energies of Europe would have been trodden out beneath universal conquest; and the history of the world, like the history of Asia, would have become a mere record of the rise and fall of despotic dynasties, of the incursions of barbarous hordes, and of the mental and political prostration of millions beneath the diadem, the tiara, and the sword.'—Vol. i. pp. 35, 36.

Such was the gloomy prospect of the civilized world, when Miltiades, on the afternoon of a September day, B. C. 490, gave word for the Athenian army to prepare for battle. Then resounded along the mountain slopes of Marathon, as the warrior-citizens of the free commonwealth¹ rushed down upon the plain, that spirit-stirring battle-cry, which Æschylus tells us was afterwards heard over the waves of Salamis:—

ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων, ἴτε
Ἐλευθεροῦτε πατρίδ', ἐλευθεροῦτε δὲ
Παῖδας, γυναῖκας, θεῶν τε πατρῶων εἶδη,
Θήκας δὲ προγόνων. Νῦν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀγών.²

Long and obstinately was the fight contested, but victory at last declared for Greece; the Persians fled to their galleys; and on the following day the baffled armada returned to the coasts of Asia.

'It was not indeed by one defeat, however signal, that the pride of Persia could be broken, and her dreams of universal empire dispelled. Ten years afterwards she renewed her attempts upon Europe on a grander scale of enterprise, and was repulsed by Greece with great and reiterated loss. Larger forces and heavier slaughter than had been seen at Marathon, signalised the conflicts of Greeks and Persians at Artemisium, Salamis, Plataea, and the Eurymedon. But mighty and momentous as those battles were, they rank not with Marathon in importance. They originated no new impulse. They turned back no current of fate. They were merely confirmatory of the already existing bias which Marathon had created. The day of Marathon is the critical epoch in the history of the two nations. It broke for ever the spell of Persian invincibility, which had previously paralyzed men's minds. It generated among the Greeks that spirit which beat back Xerxes, and afterwards led on Xenophon, Agesilaus, and Alexander, in terrible retaliation through their Asiatic campaigns. It secured for mankind the intellectual treasures of Athens, the growth of free institutions, the liberal enlightenment of the Western world, and the gradual ascendancy for many ages of the great principles of European civilization.'—Vol. i. pp. 56, 57.

¹ 'Equality of rights shows, not in one instance only, but in every way, what an excellent thing it is. For the Athenians, when governed by tyrants, were superior in war to none of their neighbours; but when freed from tyrants became by far the first; this, then, shows that as long as they were oppressed, they purposely acted as cowards, as labouring for a master; but when they were free, every man was zealous to labour for himself.'—*Herodotus*, v. 78.

² Æschylus, 'Persæ,' 402.

The destruction of the Athenian fleet in the harbour of Syracuse, B. C. 413, is selected by Professor Creasy as the second decisive battle of the world. Athens was indebted for her greatness to that navy which Themistocles, who replaced the spear by the oar, first launched into the waters of the Ægean. When the Englishman of the olden time boasted of trusting to Britannia's Wooden Walls, he only repeated the maxim of Pericles, the soundness of which had been established by the battles of Salamis and the Eurymedon: and hence it was that *naval* defeat was fatal to Athenian greatness. The catastrophe of Ægospotamos was prepared in the harbour of Syracuse. 'Had the great expedition of Athens against Syracuse proved 'victorious,' observes Dr. Arnold, 'the energies of Greece 'during the next eventful century would have found their field 'in the west no less than in the east: Greece, and not Rome, 'might have conquered Carthage; Greek, instead of Latin, 'might have been at this day the principal element of the language of Spain, of France, and of Italy; and the laws of 'Athens, rather than of Rome, might be the foundation of the 'law of the civilized world.' Again: 'Syracuse was a break-water, which God's providence raised up to protect the yet 'immature strength of Rome.'

'And her triumphant repulse of the great Athenian expedition against her, was of even more wide-spread and enduring importance. It forms a decisive epoch in the strife for universal empire, in which all the great states of antiquity successively engaged and failed.'—Vol. i. p. 67.

We have seen Athens victorious, and Athens defeated: we are now to see her under both conditions; politically subdued, but sovereign over human intellect. It has been the prerogative of the city of Minerva to hold forth the brightest lights of mental philosophy; to breathe the deepest inspirations of dramatic genius; to inculcate the innermost lessons of political wisdom; to advance architecture and sculpture to their highest perfection: but it was reserved to Macedon, under the 'great Emathian Conqueror,' as Sir Walter Raleigh has designated him, to scatter those influences abroad, and to diffuse those lights among mankind at large. Descending from the mountains of Macedonia, Alexander subjugated Greece, no longer worthy of freedom; and then distributed her intellectual treasures, with lavish hand, throughout all the world. Of his many battles, that of Arbela,¹ B. C. 331, in which he overthrew Darius, was the most critical. Professor Creasy regards this as the third decisive battle of the world. Central Asia had,

¹ Strictly, of Gargamela. The city of Arbela was more than twenty miles from the actual scene of conflict.

indeed, yet to fall before the shock of the Macedonian phalanx; Alexander had yet to conquer Affghanistan; to annex the Punjab:—

‘But the great object of his mission was accomplished, and the ancient Persian empire, which once menaced all nations of the earth with subjection, was irreparably crushed, when Alexander won his crowning victory at Arbela.’—Vol. i. p. 146.

That battle not only subverted that Oriental dynasty which had succeeded to the throne of the second great empire of the ancient world, but it established European rulers in its stead; broke up the monotony of the East by Western energies; impressed the Hellenic character upon Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt; diffused the language and civilization of Greece through every country of the known world, from the shores of the *Ægean* to the banks of the Indus, from the Caspian and the Hyrcanian plain to the cataracts of the Nile; and thus, among other great effects, prepared the way for the subsequent diffusion of that which is wiser than all the philosophies of men, and stronger than all their hosts,—the Gospel of Jesus Christ committed to His Church!

‘The Greek States,’ says Schlegel,¹ ‘have long since disappeared from the face of the earth: the republics, as well as the Macedonian kingdoms founded by Alexander, have long since ceased to exist. Many centuries—near two thousand years—have elapsed, since not a vestige has remained of that ancient greatness and power. If the celebrated battles and other mighty events of those ages are still known to us, if they still excite in us a lively interest, it is principally because they have been delineated with such incomparable beauty, such instructive interest, by the great classical writers. It is not the republican governments of Greece, nor the brief and fleeting period of Grecian liberty, which was so soon succeeded by civil war and anarchy,—it is not the universal empire of Macedon, which was of but short duration, and was soon swallowed up in the Roman or Parthian domination,—it was not these that mark out the place which Greece occupies in the great whole of universal history, and the mighty and important part she has had in the civilization of mankind. The share allotted to her was the light of science in its most ample extent, and in all the clear brilliance of exposition which it could derive from art.’ But it was more than this. So long as Divine Truth was to be preserved rather than propagated, it had been enshrined in a language of stereotyped and stationary character; but no sooner does the epoch arrive for its promulgation throughout all lands,

¹ *Philosophy of History*, Lect. viii.

than it is committed to that language, which, by its flexibility and general diffusion, was best calculated to convey the glad tidings of salvation to the myriads of mankind.¹ The Eastern conquests of the great Macedonian directly subserved this all-important end, by extending the language of Greece—that most perfect instrument of human thought—throughout the known world.

And now, passing over the stirring events of a century and a quarter, we take our stand on the banks of the little river Metaurus, which falls into the Adriatic midway between Rimini and Ancona. The battle of Zama, B.C. 201,—when Scipio trampled Carthage beneath the hoofs of his Numidian cavalry, whom he had won over from the ranks of the enemy, so bringing to an end the second Punic war,—would appear at first sight to have been the crisis of the struggle for ascendancy between Rome and her great Phœnician rival; but the power of Carthage was really broken when the gory head of Hasdrubal was flung, with the characteristic brutality of the Romans, after the battle of the Metaurus, B.C. 207, into his brother's camp.² When the great Carthaginian saw that eye glazed in death, from which he had looked for the flash of victory; when the meeting between the two sons of Hamilcar,—after a separation of ten years, during which one had been fighting against Rome in Spain with perilous success, the other with doubtful issue in Italy itself,—when this meeting proved to be a meeting between the living and the dead, then Hannibal groaned aloud, and recognized his country's destiny:—

'And that battle was the determining crisis of the contest, not merely between Rome and Carthage, but between the two great families of the world, which then made Italy the arena of their oft-renewed contest for preeminence.'—Vol. i. p. 158.

'It is not without reason,' observes Michelet,³ 'that so universal and vivid a remembrance of the Punic wars has dwelt in the memories of men. They formed no mere struggle to determine the lot of two cities or two empires; but it was a strife on the event of which depended the fate of two races of mankind,—whether the empire of the world should belong to the Indo-Germanic or to the Semitic family of nations.' When Carthage fell, 'then occurred that which has no parallel in history:—an entire civilization perished at a blow, vanished like

¹ See 'Christian Remembrancer,' vi. 182.

² 'Quid debeat, O Roma, Neronibus,
Testis Metaurum flumen, et Hasdrubal
Devictus'—HORAT. Carm. iv. Od. 4.

³ *Histoire Romaine*, ii. 38.

‘a falling star! The “Periplus” of Hanno, a few coins, a score of lines in Plautus, and, lo! all that remains of the Carthaginian world!’

The fifth decisive battle of the world in Professor Creasy’s list, is the victory of Arminius over the Roman legions under Varus, A.D. 9. Mighty events have intervened; and Rome, the fourth great empire of prophecy, has become mistress of the world. The very change we now make in our chronological computation,—looking back upon that event to which we have hitherto been looking forward,—forcibly reminds us, in connexion with our present subject, of that great prophecy,—‘The greaves of the warrior, his weapons, and his garments rolled in blood—these shall be a burning and fuel of fire. For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace!’

Some centuries were, indeed, to pass, before the legs of iron and the feet of clay, seen by the king of Babylon in prophetic vision, were to be broken to pieces, and carried away like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, by the stone cut out of the mountain without hands; but the defeat of the Roman legions, in the reign of Augustus, by Hermann the Cheruscan,—a lineal ancestor of the Anglo-Saxon race,—foreshadowed that doom. It was, moreover, the dawn of a new principle of political life. It secured at once and for ever, at the earliest stage of modern history, the independence of the Teutonic race; and prepared the way for the introduction into the civilization of the common-wealth of Europe, of the vital and determining element of personal liberty. To Rome the element of legality is due, under the majestic form of Civil Law, together with the tradition and inheritance of Grecian intellect; to the Catholic Church, the element of morality impersonated in the living Gospel of Jesus; while to the Germans we are indebted for the restless spirit of individual freedom, expanding at all risks, and impelling the entire mass of modern society in the direction of progressive improvement. After the victory of the great Cheruscan,—whom Tacitus confesses to have been ‘liberator haud dubie Germaniæ,’¹ and who, as time passed on, received divine honours from the gratitude of the German tribes,²—the

¹ *Annales*, ii. 88.

² ‘The Irmin-sul, or the column of Hermann, near Eresburg, the modern Stad-berg, was the chosen object of worship to the descendants of the Cherusci, the old Saxons; and in defence of which they fought most desperately against Charlemagne and his Christianised Franks.’—i. 247.

Rhine became the acknowledged boundary of the two nations. 'Hac clade factum,' says Florus, 'ut imperium quod in litore 'Oceani non steterat, in ripa Rheni fluminis staret.'

We now come down to the battle of Châlons, A.D. 451. The year 445 of our era completed the twelfth century from the foundation of Rome; when twelve vultures, it was said, appeared to Romulus, signifying the duration of the Roman power for that period. Add to these six lustra of five years each, for the six birds that appeared to Remus, and we have precisely the year 476, when the Western Empire was finally extinguished by Odoacer. Hence we can readily imagine the consternation of the Romans when Attila, that ruthless Hun, embattled his Asiatic forces against the decaying empire. The battle of Châlons was the final victory of the City of the Seven Hills.

'The victory which the Roman general, Aetius, with his Gothic allies, then gained over the Huns, was the last victory of Imperial Rome. But among the long Fasti of her triumphs, few can be found that, for their importance and ultimate benefit to mankind, are comparable with this expiring effort of her arms. It did not, indeed, open to her any new career of conquest,—it did not consolidate the relics of her power,—it did not turn the rapid ebb of her fortunes. The mission of Imperial Rome was, in truth, already accomplished. She had received and transmitted the civilization of Greece. She had broken up the barriers of narrow nationalities among the various states and tribes that dwelt around the coasts of the Mediterranean. She had fused these and many other races into one organized empire, bound together by a community of laws, government, and institutions. Under the shelter of her full power the true faith had arisen in the earth, and during the years of her decline it had been nourished to maturity, and had overspread all the provinces that ever obeyed her sway. For no beneficial purpose to mankind could the dominion of the seven-hilled city have been restored or prolonged. But it was all-important to mankind what nations should divide among them Rome's rich inheritance of empire. Whether the Germanic and Gothic warriors should form states and kingdoms out of the fragments of her dominions, and become the free members of the commonwealth of Christian Europe; or whether pagan savages, from the wilds of Central Asia, should crush the relics of classic civilization, and the early institutions of the Christianized Germans, in one hopeless chaos of barbaric conquest. The Christian Visigoths of King Theodoric fought and triumphed at Châlons, side by side with the legions of Aetius. Their joint victory over the Hunnish host, not only rescued for a time from destruction the old age of Rome, but preserved for centuries of power and glory the Germanic element in the civilization of modern Europe.'—Vol. i. pp. 259, 260.

We now approach that battle which led to Mr. Hallam's note. Among those signal deliverances which have affected for centuries the happiness of mankind, a foremost place must be assigned to Charles Martel's victory over the Saracens, A.D.

732. This critical conflict between the Crescent and the Cross changed, says Gibbon, the history of the world.

‘The more we test its importance, the higher we shall be led to estimate it; and though all authentic details which we possess of its circumstances and its heroes are but meagre, we can trace enough of its general character to make us watch with deep interest this encounter between the rival conquerors of the decaying Roman empire. That old classic world, the history of which occupies so large a portion of our early studies, lay, in the eighth century of our era, utterly inanimate and overthrown. On the north, the German, on the south, the Arab was rending away its provinces. At last the spoilers encountered one another, each striving for the full mastery of the prey.’—Vol. i. p. 289.

Subject to one Caliph, who ruled from the Pyrenees to the Oxus—believers in one prophet—holding the Koran in reverence as the one book of their law,—a veteran Saracen army, under Abderrahman, one of their ablest commanders, advanced to the conquest of Europe north of the Pyrenees, eager for battle, and fanatically confident of success. ‘A victorious line of march,’ says Gibbon, ‘had been prolonged above a thousand miles, from the rock of Gibraltar to the banks of the Loire; the repetition of an equal space would have carried the Saracens to the confines of Poland and the Highlands of Scotland; the Rhine is not more impassable than the Nile or the Euphrates, and the Arabian fleet might have sailed without a naval combat into the mouth of the Thames. Perhaps the interpretation of the Koran would now be taught in the schools of Oxford, and her pulpits might demonstrate to a circumcised people the sanctity and truth of the revelation of Mahomet.’ Vainly did Eudes, the bold and warlike Duke of Aquitaine, endeavour to arrest the progress of the invaders. Onward rolled the overwhelming torrent to the very centre of France, between Tours and Poitiers. There it was met, to the surprise of Abderrahman, by Karl, Duke of the Austrasian Franks.¹ ‘The nations of Asia, Africa, and Europe advanced with equal ardour to an encounter which would change the history of the world.’ For seven days the fortunes of mankind hung in doubtful balance. At the end of that time victory declared for the Christian hosts, and Europe was rescued from the deadly grasp of all-destroying Islam. The battle of Tours re-established the old superiority of the Indo-Germanic over the Semitic family of mankind, and maintained the supremacy of the Cross over the invading Crescent.

¹ Surnamed *Martel*—the hammer: the favourite weapon of Thor, the war-god of Scandinavian mythology, though this has been controverted in ‘Notes and Queries.’

¹ Gibbon, v. 188.

The foregoing battles possess a certain unity of interest; they are intimately connected with the rise and fall of the Four Great Empires of prophecy. And now the Fifth Empire has been set up; that kingdom 'which shall never be destroyed,' but 'shall break in pieces and consume' other kingdoms, and 'shall stand for ever.' It is not of this world; its victories are moral, its administration is divine. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts,' shall this kingdom be established and maintained immoveable and everlasting. 'Wherefore we, receiving a Kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire.'

- ART. IX.—1. *A Plea for the Education of the Clergy; in a Letter addressed to the Lord Bishop of Exeter, and the Clergy of the Diocese, lately assembled in Synod. By the Rev. PHILIP FREEMAN, M.A. Principal of the Theological College, Chichester.* London: Rivingtons, 1851.
2. *Credenda: a Summary Paraphrase of the Apostles' Creed, from Bishop Pearson.* London: Parker, 1851.
3. *Delle cinque Piaghi della S. Chiesa. Di ANTONIO ROSMINI,* Perugia, 1849.

It is very fitting in Mr. Freeman that he addresses the admirable pamphlet which gives rise to our present article to the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter. In the recent Synod of Exeter—recent, but ever new to our respect and thankfulness—at least three-fourths of the proceedings were occupied with the subject of education. Had time permitted, doubtless, as Mr. Freeman suggests, (p. 6,) the Synod would have formally considered the topic of clerical education: as it is, Mr. Freeman commends his observations to that body who, if any, have given to the subject of education a practical consideration. We have to thank him for more constructive services; but had he done no more than dispel our ordinary vague talk on the subject of clerical education, he had done much. One of the Exeter speakers alluded, as it seems with approval, to the ordinary device of ordaining schoolmasters: against this suggestion, one of the keenest and most sensible men of the day, Chancellor Harington, immediately, and almost with warmth, protested, chiefly on the ground ‘of the great evil which would thence accrue to the college.’ (Acts of the Synod, p. 114.) He might have gone further, and specified the evils incident to the Church from this scheme. A schoolmaster’s education is as a clerical education mischievous, because it aims at a completeness which is precisely not the completeness suitable to the priest. Here we avail ourselves of Mr. Freeman’s remarks. He points out that what the Church of England needs is a *sacerdotal* education. We want to realize the clerical calling: to educate up to it, to prepare for the cure of souls, and the stewardship of the Gospel mysteries.

‘The thing needed, then, is a *systematic training, theoretical and practical,—formation, ethical and theological,—for our future Clergy during the period immediately preceding their offering themselves for Holy Orders.* The means proposed for effecting this, *the establishment of Theological Colleges such as have already for some years existed at Wells and Chichester.*—P. 13.

This is Mr. Freeman's thesis. And in support of it he argues at some length, (p. 15,) that the prevailing English system of clerical education does not come up to the apostolic injunction, 'the things that thou hast heard *commit* to faithful men, who shall be able to *teach*,' &c.—that the Church has an especial office of committing and handing over truth to its ministers—that an actual delivery and gift is supposed. As a fact, the deposit is transmitted: but the question is (p. 16), '*how*, by what means, through what process, was it intended it should be conveyed?' Through direct teaching, Mr. Freeman answers; by living teachers, not by documents and formularies only. At p. 20, our author points out the absolute losses which we have suffered in neglecting a literal compliance with the apostolic injunction: to this cause he traces our lamentable divisions. We extract the passage:—

'These divisions are, I venture to say, almost entirely the growth of this neglect. Let us suppose, that at some favourable period of our Church's past history, say in the days of the great Caroline school of Divines, from Andrewes to Sanderson and Pearson,—seminaries for the Clergy had been instituted, in which the voice of those apostolically minded chief pastors, or of others commissioned by them, might have been heard as a living comment on the Scriptures, the Creeds, and the Formularies, which they so ably defended and so truly expounded, according to the mind of the early Church; that by this means those documents had not been merely placed in their hands to study, but commended to them with a definite interpretation, received from those who had gone before, and proveable out of Scripture itself, and the old Catholic doctors: "Thus and thus we have received and deliver to you, on such a point:" "such and such has invariably been the meaning of the phrase Regeneration, or the like; or the intention of the Church in this or that thanksgiving after reception of Baptism or Holy Communion." Let us suppose such a teaching as this to have been imparted to that generation of Clergy, which in its turn was to teach the next, and so on to our own day; and can we conceive that so *vast* a diversity, so *distinct* a yea and nay, could have come to exist among us on the most fundamental points of Christian doctrine? But the contrary of all this has been hitherto done. Each generation of Clergy has studied and thought for itself, with little of counsel or guidance from that which preceded it. The consequences seem to be very distinctly traceable in the defective *theological* character of that spiritual re-awakening, which, towards the commencement of the present century, took place as a reaction from the lethargy of the preceding one. Whether that lethargy would have been averted by the existence of sound and definite teaching, maintained in schools of Divinity such as I am supposing, may well be questioned. It seems to have flowed rather from a universal corruption of manners, which, owing to various causes, had set in like a torrent, and undermined the moral outworks of the Faith. But when the reaction came, then was seen at once the difference between a theologically trained Clergy, and one which had received no training at all. Divinity, as a religious and spiritual system, based on the facts of the Creed, was unknown. A wrong watch-word was taken up; a subjective truth, instead of an objective one, was laid hold of as a basis whereon to rest the whole weight of a Christian's standing before God. The central fact of our Lord's Incarnation, and the

Sacraments which derive their life from it, lost their due place in the Christian scheme, and infinite confusions were the necessary consequence. Through what struggles, and with what losses, we have won our way back even to the semblance of a united reassertion of fundamental verities, is known to all men, to none better than to those whom I am addressing.'—Pp. 20—22.

But it is replied, Have we no remedies and safeguards? Is there no clerical education? do not our Universities supply it? First, Mr. Freeman seems to say, as a fact, they do not; and next, as a theorem, they ought not to attempt it: they are not the places for it. The ordinary curriculum is not that specific teaching which we have in view; and Oxford and Cambridge are not *the* places for the ordinary year between the B. A. degree and the Diaconate.

'If I may speak for a moment of my own experience,—and my occupations have been such as to give opportunity for both these kinds of observation;—I would even say that I have the strongest sense of the unkindness, the real injury that it would be to the future generations of the Clergy, to insist upon their spending at the University, as a universal rule, the year generally intervening between their degree and Ordination. Not merely on the ground of expense,—though this has been found to be a serious, and, indeed, insuperable difficulty,—but chiefly because it would take away the one chance and opportunity—valuable even to those of the most blameless habits, absolutely needed by so many—of making a change of ways, of scene, and of associates, just at the point where the merely secular life and studies are to be exchanged for the graver ones of the professed candidate for a sacred office. It is no disparagement to the Universities thus to speak, since the unfitness alleged of them for this purpose arises, in a great measure, from their very fitness to discharge their ordinary functions. All that is alleged is, that they cannot be to their *alumni* two distinct and somewhat opposite things, or wear two faces, in rapid succession; they cannot give them, up to a certain point, as ordinary citizens, the advantages of a mixed and secular system, and then suddenly become to them an atmosphere for graver studies, and a more solemn calling. It is here that Theological Colleges in the several Dioceses are at once seen to possess an advantage over the Universities for the purpose under consideration; they can hold out what the Universities, *vi terminorum*, in virtue of their very name of University, cannot—freedom from the distractions of a place of mixed and secular study, opportunity for reconsideration, and, if need be, change of ways and habits; comparative fewness of numbers; closer personal intercourse between the teacher and student in consequence. Nor let it be thought that the Universities will have abdicated their ancient and inalienable theological character and functions, though the proper training of the parochial Clergy should be committed to other hands. Abundant work of a theological kind will still devolve upon them; the foundations of theological knowledge will still continue to be laid by them even for the Clergy at large; and a numerous class, formed out of the members of foundations, and others who continue resident after the B.A. degree, will never be wanting to attend the lectures of the Professors. But above all, it is at the Universities that the matured theologian will continue, as of old, to be formed; nor can they possibly discharge a more important office than that of thus raising up more accomplished Masters of sacred learning, and Champions of the

Faith, than we can expect to find in our ordinarily trained and qualified Clergy.'—Pp. 25—27.

After speaking of the need of such specific training for acquiring a practical character, the Letter proceeds to a more delicate subject, which is thus skilfully, yet faithfully treated.

'Let me be allowed to say, then, that what appears to be the prevailing defect of us, the Clergy of the English Church, as a body, is a certain *secularity*—manifesting itself, of course, in various ways, but springing, as I believe, from one root, and having a uniformly lowering effect on the outward aspect, and of course on the inward efficiency, of the entire body. There is no more favourite mark than this for the shafts of rival communions; no imperfection which so surely, though secretly, undermines the best directed labours of the Clergy. It is not enough that the Clergy should be blameless in their lives, and diligent in their ministrations, remaining in all other respects,—I mean as to habits of mind and of conversation,—undistinguishable from other men. There must be a touch, a *χαρακτήρ*, differentiating them inwardly from men in general, and sure, more or less, to give outward evidence of itself. Whence that touch and note of difference should come, it is not difficult to judge: it must come, in some way, of their peculiar commission and vocation: the "live coal" that "touches" and marks them must be taken from the altar. Let me not be misunderstood. I speak of no flights of high asceticism for the Clergy, nor of obtaining reverence for them in the eyes of the people by laying upon them "counsels of perfection" which our Church disclaims exacting of them.'—Pp. 30, 31.

Mr. Freeman proceeds to show that the absence of strictly clerical training shows itself 'in the deficiency among us (1) of a *priestly*, and (2) of a *theological* habit of mind' (p. 31). Towards producing the former, after showing its especial value to priests of moderately populous cures, Mr. Freeman selects the daily service of the Church, and assuming the obligation of the recital, either in public or private, by the priest, of his office, thus speaks of its practical value.

'And surely this practice is the master-key, as of various other kinds of excellence in the priestly office, so especially of the maintenance, under all circumstances, of the priestly habit of mind. For it brings the flock daily before the mind in the most solemn manner, and so is a daily bond of union with them, and opportunity of doing them good. There may or may not be a congregation to be found to join in this service with the Clergy; but whether there be or not, their own position towards their flock is equally recognised and realized by their personal use of the office. They are Priests, performing every day of their lives a proper priestly function. Surely they cannot, maintaining this practice, easily forget themselves into mere secular men. Those who have much other clerical work will be rescued by this daily dividing of themselves "betwixt the mount and multitude," from the risk of merging the Priest in the mere man of business; they will have a point of view, daily taken up, from which every detail of labour will wear a heavenward aspect: while those whose danger is from the absence of calls upon their activity, will receive a daily moulding after "the mind of Christ;" one which insensibly enlightens and elevates; which gives a distaste for unbecoming pursuits, and administers a caution

in the use even of indifferent ones. This practice is also, it need scarcely be added, a daily link of communion with the whole Church, and thus, besides the positive benefits of such communion, fosters a sense of sympathy and fellowship, and of the dignity of the ministerial calling, eminently sustaining and invigorating in circumstances of outward isolation from the rest of the Body. It is somewhat humiliating to us as a Church that the duty and the benefits of the Church's appointed offices being used by the Clergy should need to be insisted upon: and to some it will appear superfluous. But though I am well aware that what I have said is matter of obvious truth to thoughtful persons, and that hundreds and even thousands of our Clergy are daily acting upon it, yet it cannot be denied that such views and such practice are still the exception and not the rule, and greatly need some vigorous effort for their general restoration among us.'—Pp. 37, 38.

As to the theological mind, though Mr. Freeman admits its inferiority as an essential, yet he is fully alive to its importance. We should have been glad could Mr. Freeman have embraced, within his subject, our deficiencies in scientific and technical theology. An Anglican *Dens* is what we want—a work at once cheap, full, and precise. With his clear and concise answer to a popular objection, we close our extracts from Mr. Freeman's pamphlet.

'To multiply such Colleges, it has been alleged, would only be to systematize and stereotype our divisions, by forming rival schools of theology. But,—not to say that such an objection would equally hold against teaching what we believe to be truth in our several parishes,—I venture to anticipate a result the very contrary of this. If it be admitted, that in all cases such training would be carried on in close practical connexion with the Church's system,—in the constant use as well as careful study of her Offices and Formularies (and it is inconceivable that any other course could for a moment be proposed);—the effect must surely rather be to draw us towards each other than to widen our differences. The force of truth, especially on the minds of young men, is great; and we may rely upon it that, using one language, the language of their spiritual Mother, in their daily devotions,—having withal a studious leisure in which to judge what is her mind expressed therein,—and being about to take upon them a solemn vow to hold and teach accordingly,—they can scarcely arrive at any very widely divergent conclusions. If it be said, Whence then our existing differences? I answer, confidently, that they are *not* the fruit of any such calm, dispassionate and religious consideration, as that for which I am here supposing opportunities to be given, but of the absence of all such favourable circumstances for forming a judgment. And I can testify that in the experience of both the existing Theological Colleges, such an acquiescence in one mind as to Church doctrine has all but uniformly,—with the rarest possible exceptions,—been the result, whatever the bias previously received, of thus using and pondering the Church's forms of worship and communion.'—Pp. 42, 43.

To the testimonies alleged by Mr. Freeman in proof of the existing deficiencies of clerical education, others might easily be added. Such is the well-known disappointment expressed by Cranmer at not having been able to secure colleges for the education of the Clergy out of the ruins of the monastic in-

stitutions. Such is Lord Bacon's exclamation: 'Is there no man to train and nurse up ministers? for the yield of the Universities will not serve: to *train*, I say," &c.¹ A curiously coincident view, again, as to the real origin of our present divisions, appeared simultaneously in this *brochure*, and in the preface to the well-timed little work which stands second in our list:—

'There is much, very much, to discourage in the present aspect of the British Churches, and yet there is one great encouragement. There can be no difficulty in tracing the chief of our present evils to their true cause. That cause is—the absence of anything like a stated course of systematic preparatory teaching and discipline for the candidates for our sacred ministry. In many cases they have not been taught or trained professionally at all; and in no case, until within the last few years, was any sufficient plan attempted to be laid down, or institution formed, to provide for aspirants to Holy Orders that which is required (?) for every other profession, and which is essential, in order that so large a body of men should "all speak the same thing." Our Clergy, for the most part, have been left to pick up their notions of theology, and their knowledge of the most indispensable duties of their sacred calling, how and where they could. No wonder they have had so little agreement among themselves, have too often spoken to their people "with stammering lips;" and where they have been most confident in themselves, and most disposed to condemn others, have been often least instructed, and least competent for their work. This, then, has been, and still is, our great and sore disease, arising, we would fain hope, less from perverse love of darkness, than from unhappy ignorance of the light. Evidence has been given in the highest quarters of the Church, of want not of piety, or zeal—so far God be thanked—but of the most elementary theological attainments, such as a proper scholastic study of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments alone would have been sufficient to secure. And when this has been the case with our very hierarchy, who can be surprised that our lay gentry and aristocracy should be still more deficient in the simplest principles of their religious faith and practice?'—*Credenda*, Pref. pp. 3—5.

The work of Rosmini, a popular Italian divine, has a curious and interesting bearing upon the question before us. It is well known that one master-stroke of the Council of Trent,² was the establishment of seminaries for the Clergy. The need of some such system, the ground upon which it rests, and the watchful care with which it requires to be administered, are forcibly put by this reforming Romanist writer. The following sketch of his views is from a cotemporary:—

'In the first ages of the Church, preaching and the services of public worship were the great schools of the Christian people, in which, by word and sacrament, the great truths of religion were brought home to the hearts of the believing. The first teachers appealed, not only to the intellectual but to the moral man; and the priests of the new religion, chosen from among the faithful, and raised to the high honour of the Christian ministry, felt all the solemnity of their holy office, when a simple layman,

¹ Works, vol. ii. 8vo.

² Sess. xxiii. chap. 18.

untaught in the schools of the prophets, but taught of the Spirit, was called by the voice of the people to the oversight of the flock; and, refusing in vain, became a burning and shining light, a S. Ambrose or S. Martin. "As were the people, so were the Priests," who issued from the people. And now look at the Church in our day; the rule still holds, "Like people, like Priests;" the people now are present at the services of the Church as spectators at a show: there is no clear understanding of the duty and dignity of membership in the Body of Christ—no union of mind and heart with the Clergy, so that both may prostrate themselves with a common feeling, before "Him with Whom they have to do." The Clergy are rather regarded as a peculiar and privileged class, living by the altar—a caste and a sect, apart from others, and separated from the great body of the faithful. Hence the affairs of the Church are spoken of as the affairs of the Priests; and from a Christian laity so ill-taught, and so ignorant of the spiritualities of their religion, issue the priests, bringing with them the meagreness of instruction gained in such a school; and the secular spirit still lurks under the black robe, ignorant alike of lay Christianity and Christian Priesthood, and of the bond by which they are united. These narrow-minded priests communicate to others who are to succeed them the slender stream of their instruction, and they again to others; and so the process of deterioration goes on.

A second reason of this insufficient education is the giving over of the instruction of the Clergy to men unfitted for the office. In the earlier days the Bishops were the teachers: Athanasius grew up under the shadow of Alexander, a scholar worthy of the master; Irenæus had learned from Polycarp, and Polycarp from S. John. Brought up at the feet of the Apostles, the Timothy and Tituses were prepared to carry on the work of winning souls to Christ. Thus from one race of Pastors to another, the truth was handed down, and the bond of union between the members of the Church preserved. The distinctions of higher and lower Clergy were then unknown. The Bishop was himself the teacher; the instruction of the people was rarely committed to other hands, except in cases of extraordinary genius and sanctity, as when Chrysostom was chosen preacher by Flavius of Antioch, or Augustin by Valerius of Carthage,—and much less the duty of teaching the teachers.

Another cause of insufficient education is the use of mere elementary books. In the early ages of the Church, the sacred Scriptures were the only test of popular and ecclesiastical instruction—the Scriptures, which are truly *the Book* of the human race—the Bible—the Scripture by Autonomasia. Such a code paints humanity from its beginning to its end. This great book, in the hands of great men, who expounded it, was the nutriment of other great men. Hence the Pastors of the Church were also the great writers of antiquity, except in rare cases, where genius opened to a Tertullian or an Origen the way to the chair of Christian instruction. These books of the early Fathers served, in their turn, for the education of the Clergy.

* * * * *

We will now take up, chiefly in the way of comment on Mr. Freeman's pamphlet, and of enlargement upon the topics of it, such considerations as the subject suggests. And on one ground, at least, we may not unreasonably hope to interest our readers in it. It is the ordinary resource of writers of fiction to place human nature in some new and unimagined, perhaps impossible circumstances. The field for the writer, and the interest for the reader,

lies, of course, in solving and seeing solved the problem, how the new situation will tell upon the old and known elements of man's head and heart; how these are to be drawn out so as to have their appropriate play with reference to some defined purpose. It is generally assumed that everyday life has long ceased to be likely to present any such new combinations, (at least in any regular recurrence,) as may fairly be taken to constitute a new probation, and so to require to be met by a new system of appliances. Yet the case before us shows that such combinations are by no means exhausted, but are ready to spring into existence so soon as we begin to look narrowly into the *status quo* in which we have acquiesced, until we have come to think it the only possible state of things. In the higher kinds of education, especially, it is all but the law of nature that we should follow, with packhorse regularity, in the steps of preceding generations. There is the old system for us, or none; we cannot create, if we desired it, new institutions to fill up any gap we may espy, just at the very moment that we espy it. On such *desiderata*, it is thought, it is vain to dwell. And so we come, after a while, to be unconscious, or very imperfectly conscious, that there are any defects at all. Many persons would be surprised to be told, that it is a habit of this country,—an English habit, whencesoever derived,—to leave out some one whole stage of education; and that too, generally, the highest, the most delicate, that which most of all requires the master's hand and touch—namely, the ultimate and completing stage. And yet it would be difficult to point to any profession in which one or other of the three *layers* of education, so to speak, proper to the three confessed stages, of childhood, youth, and manhood, is not systematically omitted. Sometimes it is the intermediate term that is omitted; but most commonly, as we have said, the last. For the barrister, the physician, and the divine—the flower, be it observed, of intellectual professions,—the base of life's column is indeed founded deep and strong, in a lengthened boyhood at school; and the shaft shoots up fair and straight, in a college course stretching to the verge of manhood, and beyond it; but when we look for the wider spread and more minute finish of capital and entablature, to serve at once as the impost of life's professional burden, and as the distinctive of its several callings, we are constrained to confess that it is wanting. All alike omit, more or less, this crowning feature of a strictly professional course of training, and pass at once, as if impatient of a restraint already so prolonged, into the full exercise of their professional functions. Here, then, is the new and untried position, suggestive of countless questions as to the manner of treating it, and the influences to be employed, in order to do justice to it. Here

is a portion in the tract of human life, which hitherto, encroached upon on the one side and on the other, has never been claimed for its rightful purpose, or made to produce its proper fruits. The first step must be to procure a due recognition of its existence, and to set up its true balks and landmarks. In the case now more immediately before us, that of the Clergy, such a recognition is, in words at least, pretty generally accorded: few, indeed, would be found unwilling to admit the postulate, that our clergy stand in need of a direct professional training. The limits of it, again, if somewhat narrow, have the advantage of being sharply defined. The bachelor's degree on the one hand, and the age at which ordination is canonically possible on the other, must be held to circumscribe, as the rule for the many, the average period of immediate preparation. This we must accept, and make the best of it.

And the inquiry which then presents itself for solution—viz. how to turn this period to its proper account, is, we conceive, as interesting as it must be confessed to be novel. A period which it has hitherto been found convenient to slur over and ignore, to spend vaguely, and to commit to chance and caprice, presents itself to us as a well-defined blank to be filled up with some equally well-defined occupations, and a treatment according to the requirements of the entire case. We have found, as it were, a new year of life, for the due use of which our experience does not help us with a precedent. And surely a *mirabilis annus*, taken altogether, it must be esteemed. Rich with the spoils and the produce, be the same more or less, of some twenty years of previous tillage, it is entrusted with the final laying out of these to the effectual achievement of the most solemn purpose that man can entertain. It is not merely a fresh stage of education, but materially a different one. An altogether novel sense of responsibility dawns upon young men on assuming the *toga virilis* (for such in practice it is) of the baccalaureate. Even in the case of the more thoughtful kind of men, it will most probably be found that a certain passivity has accompanied the steps of their progress, regularly planned out as these are, through the University course. A less known and prescript future lies beyond the step by which the majority are emancipated from academic shackles: and the plunge into it must generally be accompanied by a sensation as of grasping, by the force of habit, for a support and direction now no longer provided. Self-dependence and responsible destiny, in a word, are realized. There is a feeling too, of certain experiments—experiments which are the slow yet ordained process for ripening the human agent—having been tried, to be tried by them no more. They are now in the main, in the matter of formation,

very much what they will be through life. There are no more such stages of growth, physical and mental, to be gone through, as they have gone through in boyhood and later youth: stages of wonder and possibilities, and rapid expansion to moral and intellectual influences undreamt of beforehand. The general outlines, at least, of what lies within man's horizon, are before them. Maturity, in short, is realized. These and kindred considerations render it really a very fresh and untrodden inquiry, how to deal with this new-found plot of life, even before arriving to the consideration of the destiny contemplated, being that of the sacred office. When that consideration is taken in, the interest of the question, and its solemnity, is of course greatly intensified. It is no light question,—it is one which will accept of no random answer,—What shall be the last touch a human hand should give to that wondrous complex thing of body, soul, and spirit, which in a few short months is to receive the awful unearthly shaping which makes of a man a Priest in the Church of God?

It is well, when in a matter of such concernment some advances of a practical kind, involving the great elements of toil and time, have been made towards a solution. And thus much, at least, the existing colleges for training the Clergy, founded ten or twelve years since in two of our cathedral cities, may be held to have done for us. We shall not discuss *de novo* the relative advantages of other plans or places for the purpose, which might be proposed: but rather, accepting this as one system of influences which has been found fairly to answer the desired end, single out for remark some respects in which the final shaping of candidates for the ministry of the Church will take place under it.

The most appropriate term in which to describe their position is, perhaps, that it is that of *professed persons* passing through a sort of novitiate. They have not, as yet, taken upon them the vows of the sacred office, but they profess, by resorting to such a place, their intention to do so, and that with somewhat more of solemnity and set purpose than by any former act tending to the same result. They stand committed to present themselves for Holy Orders, to this degree at least,—that for them to turn back would seem both to themselves and others a blameworthy infirmity of purpose. And the first duty of this position will be to form, by the use of means supplied for the purpose, a certain mind. This must occupy the first place, the acquirement of theological knowledge the second. Men so circumstanced are of course to gather information by every means, and for all purposes which lie before them; for future preaching, teaching, and guiding; but they must rely far less on the stores

they thus lay up, than on *the mind they make*. That is the great instrument which, under God, they are to work with after all. They will have to do a certain work on men's souls; to produce a certain result—image—conformation: and that image and conformation ought to be formed in themselves first. And this not merely, nor chiefly, for example's sake; what we speak of is in a great measure a hidden result to be wrought in each man's spirit, and there to abide with God. They must *be*, in some sort, what they are to impress—must have given themselves up to the influences, the teachings, the mouldings, under which it will be their business to bring others, or they will be working, as it were, with mere machinery, as distinguished from doing work by hand. They will know nothing by experience of the effects of what they are to bring to bear on others. Hence they will both falter and be ineffective. They will neither have confidence in the remedies they are to apply, nor skill in applying them. Their own hearts, then—their own practice, experience, daily life, must be the laboratory in which to assay the heavenly temper of those spiritual weapons and aids which the Church gives to them that they may arm others with them. To take an instance or two. How shall he teach his flock to find in the use of the Church's daily prayer that help for all their daily needs which, rightly conceived of, it supplies, having never given it a full trial himself? How meet shallow objections to the practice, when trying to vindicate it on its own merits? or how call on others to adopt it as a matter of Church obedience, when he pays no such obedience himself? or how, again, recommend increase of private devotion to such as have leisure for it, having followed no such custom himself; being able neither to testify to the comfort of it, nor to direct people to the best sources, nor to speak from experience of the difficulties attending it, and their remedies? So, again, with the duties of frequent Communion, observance of days of fast and festival, and other things. It is plainly absurd to speak of the effect of such things, or of the manner of making use of them, out of books. There is only one way to learn, or to become fitted to teach concerning them—namely, doing them. This is a very obvious truth; nevertheless, it is one which but one in ten of those who enter Holy Orders take the trouble to act upon; and it is in affording opportunity for acting upon it, that the chief excellence—indeed, the *point* of such institutions as we speak of, lies. In short, between reading theology, and learning to do the work of a Priest in the Church of God, there is all the difference in the world. Clerical education is generally strictly confined to the former, which is but a branch, however important, of the latter. It being premised, then, that the first anxiety should by

and calling as members of the mystical body? A consciousness, be it remembered, which St. Paul desired for his favourite Ephesians, as the crown and in some sense the sum of all Christian graces: 'For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.' This is one great work indispensable to the ministerial character, which the Church's system of service tends to work upon us. The several departments of the Church's worship again, are, it is obvious, so much training in those several subjects. Her very order, rightly understood, is full of teaching:—Confession to God as the fitting form of first approach of sinners to His presence; Praise, in the Psalms, as our first duty and noblest function; Meditation, the other great and never ending occupation of our immortal citizenship, in the Lessons, and their corresponding Canticles; continual recollection and re-assertion of Baptismal Profession in the Creed, and of Eucharistic privileges of union and indwelling in the Collects; finally, Intercession and Thanksgiving for all men, according to Apostolic injunction, at the close:—all are so many lessons on the spiritual position and ritual duty of man.

But Cathedral service has peculiarities; and its correspondent lessons. It is the heart of a whole Diocese: for hundreds of parishes, and for tens of thousands of persons, it is the one voice, that praises and pleads without ceasing; it is a central focus to the worship, not of a parochial district, but of a wide-spread multitude: besides its particular relations, it has a universal one; representatively, at least, the whole length and breadth of the Diocese is gathered into it. Setting out of the question those who reject offered opportunities of daily service, or would reject them, there are, it may be hoped and believed, many who would gladly join in it, but whose occupation, or lack of opportunity, forbids them; while not a few offer the Church's prayer, as nearly as they may, in private. For all such, there is discharged a work of charity in Cathedral service; upon that altar are laid—approximately in all services, in the Eucharist literally—their praises and prayers. This thought and view may well serve both as a stimulus to heartiness in the use of Cathedral devotions, and as a consolation, in some degree, under the sense of fewness of numbers. Now here are high exercises, admirably adapted for the ad-

ritual and spiritual system of the Church, going on continually, and that too with a completeness, and in a high and commanding form, not perhaps experienced heretofore. The calm march of the Church's services and days and seasons in a Cathedral Church, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear, moving onward and onward still, is perhaps the grandest symbol and expression we have on earth, of the unearthly, because mystical and supernatural character of the Church militant itself. There is nothing like it that we know of except the unceasing revolution of the heavenly bodies and their attendant seasons. Day unto day utters melodious speech, and night unto night publishes praise, almost as if the Church were some mighty living machine which performed its motions independent of human agency: the Bride, an awful conscious sojourner, going up still from the wilderness to meet her Beloved. To associate themselves heart and soul in the high work which the Church has in hand in her continual service; to be a part of it, to understand it and to help it forward;—this is the privilege enjoyed in a singular degree and to special purposes by attendants on Cathedral worship. In some respects, it is true, the offering of the humblest congregation in the meanest church stands perfectly on a par with hers;—in others she has a peculiar position and function. The privilege common to all places and celebrations of Divine Service, is, to do man's noblest work, and meet man's greatest needs in the one appointed way, and this accordingly is the first thing to realize in continual services; viz. that attendance on them is, in a manner which no other action can claim, an entering into and partaking of our fellowship in the Mystical Body of Christ. The Holy Communion is, of course, the highest act of this nature, but all acts of worship possess this privilege in their degree; and to believe this, is worthily to join in such services. It need scarcely be observed how effectually formative of the spiritual mind and tone must a constant attendance on these services thus conceived of be. Continued daily access into a real though spiritual nearness to our Lord; a sort of daily feast in the very outer courts, as it were, of heaven; the nearest approach we can make, while in the flesh, to heaven itself:—what is, what ought to be, the effect of it? Truly this: to help us mightily to realize, that we do indeed, even as individual Christians, bear about with us a lifelong spiritual priesthood, a ministry inseparable from our being, whereby we are ever within the true outer holy place, offering true though unbloody sacrifice. Must not such a view, duly taken home, and cherished and lived in, interweave itself into the texture of our whole life, and help to hold us up in the consciousness of our high position

and calling as members of the mystical body? A consciousness, be it remembered, which St. Paul desired for his favourite Ephesians, as the crown and in some sense the sum of all Christian graces: 'For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.' This is one great work indispensable to the ministerial character, which the Church's system of service tends to work upon us. The several departments of the Church's worship again, are, it is obvious, so much training in those several subjects. Her very order, rightly understood, is full of teaching:—Confession to God as the fitting form of first approach of sinners to His presence; Praise, in the Psalms, as our first duty and noblest function; Meditation, the other great and never ending occupation of our immortal citizenship, in the Lessons, and their corresponding Canticles; continual recollection and re-assertion of Baptismal Profession in the Creed, and of Eucharistic privileges of union and indwelling in the Collects; finally, Intercession and Thanksgiving for all men, according to Apostolic injunction, at the close:—all are so many lessons on the spiritual position and ritual duty of man.

But Cathedral service has peculiarities; and its correspondent lessons. It is the heart of a whole Diocese: for hundreds of parishes, and for tens of thousands of persons, it is the one voice, that praises and pleads without ceasing; it is a central focus to the worship, not of a parochial district, but of a wide-spread multitude: besides its particular relations, it has a universal one; representatively, at least, the whole length and breadth of the Diocese is gathered into it. Setting out of the question those who reject offered opportunities of daily service, or would reject them, there are, it may be hoped and believed, many who would gladly join in it, but whose occupation, or lack of opportunity, forbids them; while not a few offer the Church's prayer, as nearly as they may, in private. For all such, there is discharged a work of charity in Cathedral service; upon that altar are laid—approximately in all services, in the Eucharist literally—their praises and prayers. This thought and view may well serve both as a stimulus to heartiness in the use of Cathedral devotions, and as a consolation, in some degree, under the sense of fewness of numbers. Now here are high exercises, admirably adapted for the ad-

vancement of the future minister in the life of faith, in just ritual conception, and in Church fellowship and sympathy.

While on the subject of cathedral service as such, we would remark on the light in which the use of music in Church services is to be regarded. The view commonly taken of it would perhaps be, that music being more beautiful than mere reading, is therefore fitter for the worship of God; and the ancient example of the psalms, and of the musical services in the temple generally, would be appealed to. But this view, though true as far as it goes, by no means embraces the whole idea of the Church's use of music in her services; and it would seem to restrict the use of music to praise, or to the joyful occasions or departments of worship; neither does it account for the use of the plain monotone. And it has sometimes been thought that there is this objection to habituating the candidate for Holy Orders to high musical services, that it only awakens in him a dissatisfied desire for that which, in his future parochial Church, he may never be able to realize. But it will be seen on a little consideration, that it would be equally reasonable to object to encouraging acquaintance with the perfect forms of architecture, in the case of those whose lot may be cast where it exists on a meaner scale. The fundamental idea on which the introduction of music into every part of the Church's worship rests, would seem to be this. It is well known, that the ordinary tones of the human voice used in speaking, are only in part or occasionally musical notes. Some persons use a greater number of musical tones in speaking or reading than others; but none use them exclusively. So that it may be safely affirmed, that to speak in musical notes, and no others, is not natural to man. It has been conjectured that before the Fall man spoke in musical notes: so that (in a stricter sense than was intended,) 'all creation thrilled at the *melody* of speech.' This may be no more than a conjecture; it will serve, however, as an illustration of our present subject. But though it is not natural to man—now, at any rate—to speak in perfect tones, yet it is a thing attainable by him; just as in many other respects naturally he labours under imperfection, but by effort and art can attain or approximate to perfection. Men do not find themselves in a capacity by nature to strike out the most graceful or well-proportioned forms; to combine colours harmoniously, or the like; but by art and training they can accomplish these things. So is it also with music. And instructed as well by the analogy of the Hebrew tabernacle and temple as by the spirit of the Christian religion, they have seen the propriety of offering these recovered perfections or achievements to the service of God, by employing them in places dedicated to His

worship, in the form of architecture, painting, and musical services. By the Incarnation of Christ it should seem that the curse which rested on our mental and physical, as well as on our moral and spiritual powers, was decreed, at least, to be taken off; though for their actual and complete deliverance 'from that bondage of corruption,' they, like the material body, must await 'the manifestation of the sons of God.' But the Church, in faith, makes as though it were even now taken off; her ritual presentment of herself is as of one already 'all glorious within;' just as she honours the corruptible body, even in its present estate, for the sake of its glorious destiny. She considers the perfection to which we are able by effort and training to bring our disordered mental powers, as so many instalments of the perfection and order to which we look to see all things restored in the New Creation, the new heavens and earth. In this point of view we can see what a fitness there is in bringing musical sounds, amongst other artificial achievements, into the service of the Sanctuary. As there is a real kindred between the best works of the soul and the best works of the body, so it is fitting that the latter should be admitted to participation with the former in that divine exercise, in which we anticipate the glorified estate where both body and soul will, themselves perfected, offer in common a perfect worship to the Father. It is only under this view, that the employment of musical utterance in Church services, as well penitential as joyful, in the plainer as well as the more poetical or spirited parts, is quite intelligible. It is not as being more joyful, or necessarily more beautiful, (for many, *e. g.* think, and not without reason, the monotone, however well executed, less *beautiful* than good reading,) but as more perfect in its kind, and more akin to the estate of grace. Musical utterance is the speech of the world of grace, as unmusical or mixed utterance is the speech of the natural world. For the various purposes of expression, this mode of speech may be varied, just as ordinary speech is. It may be solemn or joyful in tone; but it should never in the high places of musical service be laid aside for the ordinary utterance of the world. If these, then, be the real grounds upon which musical expression in public worship is to be based, it will at once be seen that customary attendance on such worship in a Cathedral will, independently of its other advantages, teach a lesson concerning dedication of the gift of music to God which is capable of the most varied application by the future parochial minister.

We may conclude this part of our subject, viz. the manner in which the Church Service may be made formative of the spiritual character, by pointing out what appears to be the mind which should be carried through every part of the daily service.

The first requisite is a belief in the supernatural and sacramental character of the act of common worship; that is to say, a belief that the act itself is a means of union to our Lord, because it is a means of union to His one body, the Church. The faith with which we believe in a special and plenary communication of Him in the Holy Eucharist, that faith is to be extended in its degree to every act of common worship as such, and independently of the particular things prayed for and obtained. We place ourselves thereby in communication with an ordained channel and medium of blessing and benefit; or, to express it otherwise, in an actual atmosphere of spiritual light and air. As certainly as to be in heaven were a blessed thing for the very thing's sake, and simply because it were to be in the light of God's immediate Presence; so surely, though in a lower degree, is public worship a blessed estate, simply because it is an outer court, as it were, of that Presence. Another prerequisite is the recognition and habitual sense of our continuity and oneness with the whole Catholic Church. The body with which we worship is vast, in time, and space, and number: in time it reaches back to our first fathers — 'Apostles, Patriarchs, all have place along the sacred line;' in space it extends wherever a true branch of the true Vine has reached; in number it is ten thousand times ten thousand, and our voices but feebly swell a chorus which rises from all saints in all times and lands: a view of which the *Te Deum* is the best exponent. But the sense of continuity with the earlier Church, and of oneness with the existing one, is also greatly maintained by a consideration of the identity, for the most part, and in all essential particulars, of our services with those of the universal Church for many hundreds of years, and almost from the beginning. This identity has been successfully contended for by our Ritualists, especially by Mr. Palmer. Amid all the differences of doctrine which exist between us and other branches of the Church, there is a cheering and comforting unity as to the great leading lines of our manner of common worship. This, therefore, is another feeling which we should allow to enter as largely as possible into our acts of public service.

We have followed Mr. Freeman's example in dwelling somewhat fully on the spiritual and ethical aspects of the problem which is propounded to the English Church in the inquiry, *How ought we to train our Clergy?* The truth is, that a firm hold upon spiritual things, a combination of soundness, strength, and fervour, is the great thing we want; and we firmly believe that the Church herself, if her ordinances had fair play, is fully equal to imparting all this. They have not fair play; the Clergy do not go to her school as they ought; they are not made beforehand to yield themselves up as 'disciples of her

institutions.' And in making a period for their formation, we must be careful for this one thing at least, whatever else we leave undone, that she shall have such a period of fair play and full influence as is her right. This done, however, there is of course very much to be done beside; so much, indeed, that the danger is, as we have already intimated, of attempting too much, and so doing everything perfunctorily and nothing as it should be. The vast variety of subjects into which theology divides and subdivides itself is enough to distract and confound him who for the first time enters upon the study of it. Scripture interpretations and criticism, boundless; sacred and ecclesiastical history, interminable; sacred ethics and casuistry, *ad infinitum*; Fathers and Councils, hugely voluminous; controversial studies, intricate to bewilderment; ritual, a wide field for expatiating on. These are but a few of the departments of study which present themselves as rivals for attention. It is here, then, that system and simplicity, guidance and selection, are of infinite value to the young theologian; it is a far happier and more favourable condition for him, to yield up his own unformed judgment as to choice of subjects and line of study to that of others. Much must be left untouched for the present—untouched, yet not necessarily uncared for; its place may be shown him, its relative importance assigned, the best sources and guides for pursuing it in future indicated. And if, after all, the knowledge which can by possibility be conveyed and imbibed in the period of preparation must of necessity be fragmentary, and in some degree imperfectly held, yet under higher teaching it need not be disconnected or wanting in real unity. This is the very thing which a practised theologian can do, and a learner cannot, namely, perceive and trace the connexion between all the parts of sacred knowledge. Those who have seen anything of the state of mind in theological matters which the ordinary run of our graduates bring from the University, will admit that, with many excellent elements in it, it presents on the whole, in this regard, an aspect not very much unlike a chaos; and as the process of the formation of a theological *terra firma* goes on, the analogy continues to hold in this respect, that the several patches which here and there appear, are not, to the conception of him who is the subject of the process, in any way connected with each other. Those only who are familiar with the whole range of the subject can assure and convince the student that what he learns so *πολυμερῶς* is really one whole; that a real unity, though to him as yet submerged and invisible, subsists between ethics and ritual, between catechisms and Church history. And for want of having this proved, the student is apt to study without point, without a distinct idea of

whither his path is taking him: he labours under the same discouragement as boys at school do, who *must* in the first instance learn rules and facts without an idea of what the use of them is. The educated, though still untheological student, is under no such invincible necessity of taking his early steps in the dark; he can apprehend relations and interdependencies when pointed out to him, though he would probably not have discovered them for himself. Here, then, the *digitus monstrantis* has its signal use. Neither, of course, is such guidance available, merely for the intellectual satisfaction or for the encouragement of the beginner in sacred studies: it is also the most effectual preservative against injurious and often fatal deviations from the track within which true doctrine runs. Truths and facts in divinity come before the learner's eye apart from those limitations which are the divinely provided correctives of apparently inevitable inferences from them. When a great truth first comes upon the spirit in its power, to suppose any limits to it seems to be a starting back from the homage it claims as true. This is of course a fruitful, though surely a compassionate source of many an error and heresy. Thus, one large class of errors arises from forgetfulness that the kingdom of nature is from the same Hand as is the kingdom of grace, and that the former therefore is sure to be so cared for by the common Author of both, that its provisions shall not be forgotten or swallowed up in those of the latter. From the moment God was made Very Man, a large and varied play of the influences of these two great kingdoms upon each other commenced, to last, as it should seem, or certainly to have results which are to last, throughout eternity, yet without any actual extinction of the great fundamental elements or axioms of either. 'To pare away,' in Hooker's words, 'from the one or the other element, the Divine or the Human in our Lord, was the fault or the misfortune of the old heresies: to conserve to each its proprieties, without attempting in all cases to explain the resulting fact (as, *e.g.* to reconcile Christ's restrained knowledge, as 'man,'¹ with his perfect knowledge as God), was the great work of faith, a work proceeding upon Scripture and current creed, wrought out by the faith of the first ages.' And what was natural then is natural now: the same confronting of the same phenomena of the two mighty realms of Being hurries the will into the self-same errors in kind; only the stage of their manifestation is lower. Driven away by clear and unanswerable resolutions as to the matter of fact of the original Revelation, from the subject of our Lord's Person, doubt and question have betaken them to the region of man's position, as members of His kingdom. And is there one whit

¹ Wilberforce on the Incarnation.

less danger of fatal miscarriage in the apprehension of divine truth in this region than in that which exercised the faith, the humility, and the reverence of the earlier ages? Let councils and decrees, articles and confessions, give the answer. Here, then, there is room enough for the chair of an Athanasius, and need enough for schools of Divinity. Between the rationalist, who does away with the kingdom of grace in man, and the mediævalist, who would make that kingdom to override and obliterate the laws of the kingdom of nature and fact, there are infinite shades of error. And into some of these varieties there is danger of the young theologian's running at the present day; it is difficult for him to hold with that even balance which a deeper acquaintance with Divinity can alone ensure, the great psychological truths which define the estate of regenerate man.

There are many other points of interest upon which we might have dwelt; but we feel the less concern at passing them by, that the whole subject is quite too wide to be exhausted in a single effort or a single discussion. The pamphlet to which we have so frequently referred, has pointed to a great work to be done, and to beginnings of fair promise which have been made towards its accomplishment. A few more endeavours of the same practical sort would be worth volumes of speculation. We will, therefore, do no more than draw attention to a view of the subject, which at the present day, judging by the professions that are abroad, ought to call forth an immediate response. We have attained, namely, to a recognition of such a thing as a conscience, a duty, and a mission, appertaining to the Church as a body, as distinguished from the conscience, duty, and mission of individuals. Such is our profession. Now, it is a point made good in this pamphlet, that the Church, our Church, has, besides the positive loss and evil from time to time sustained by her having neglected to train the Clergy, been, in virtue of the same negligence, betraying a conscientious trust imposed on her,—viz. that of transmitting true doctrine in the true way, or in other words, has not been safely transmitting it at all. Surely, if there be a call on the energies of our day, on the efforts of Churchmen, on the responsibility of Bishops, it is this. We rejoice to know that more than one of the Bishops, since the sending forth of this 'Plea,' has shown himself alive to the duty which it dwells upon. And of one thing we are perfectly satisfied, that until the due training of the Clergy be taken up in right earnest, Synodical action, though in a chosen Diocese here and there it may be a blessing, will in most cases be an experiment from which we could expect no blessing, because, not having wisely sown, it were a marvel, indeed, if we should profitably reap.

NOTICES.

'Tales of a London Parish,' (Masters,) come out under Mr. Bennett's *imprimatur*. This alone would make us look at the publication cheerfully: our feeling is not diminished when we find that they are by one who has, in 'Tales of Kirkbeck,' made friends among his or her readers. There is power and occasional pathos in these tales; they show a kind heart, and sympathy, and considerable command over language. As compositions, that is, in the way of invention, they are not remarkable; and we must at once say, that we have very many difficulties before we can recommend works of this character. We have doubts whether the ordinary routine of parochial visiting should be made the framework of stories. The first of this class of books, written, perhaps, before some of its imitators quitted the nursery, the late Mr. Wood's 'Death-bed Scenes,' has hardly been equalled. This was a real, if not always a judicious, book; the present 'Tales' are to our apprehension, singularly unreal: it is *not* a fact that London, or any other Clergymen, find their flocks sending for them, and addressing them, as 'the Priest':—'celebrating the mysteries,' and other phrases of the like kind, introduced for emphasis or ornament, shock some minds—repel others. It might be well—we are not going into the matter—that the Clergy did constantly make the sign of the cross, extend the hand in benediction, &c. &c.; they ought, perhaps, to be always in oratories and cassocks, reading S. Chrysostom; but it is very undeniable that they are not. Why then make these facts in a story which do not exist in actual life? What an unreal, make-believe, play-world this is, and to be filled with such solemn subjects! Our author represents a common class; writes apparently without experience of the scenes described; draws not after life, but after simulated feelings. We should say for ourselves, that the scenery is suggested by the outside, not drawn from the inside, of a London parish. To take a very slight incident—gin-shops are not let in lodgings. Again: the Scotch and Irish language, which we find in these tales, is a tongue as like that of Scotland and Ireland as it is like Cherokee. Let any of our readers who know what the poor are, say whether they ever heard a Scotch, or any other, needle-woman, discourse in this ballad-metre style: 'I didna greet, I didna sough, but it seemed as 'tho' a' the bluid in my body stood still a bit, and then rushit like a swollen 'burn into my heid,' (p. 225.) Again, when it is required to give the furniture of an atheist's room, 'Historic Doubts'—we only remember Whately's famous tract of that name—is included. All this may be ignorance; but it is, under some conditions, mischievous.

'Cousin Eustace,' (Cleaver,) is by the same writer, and seems, as far as we have examined it, to contain a sound and useful popular commentary on the Prayer Book. It is to be recommended.

The 'Memoirs of the Rev. Edward Bickersteth,' (Seeleys,) have been published by his friend, Mr. Birks. It is, in many respects, a valuable work; valuable as in the *petenda*, so in the *fugienda*, which it displays

Mr. Bickersteth's excellence was in the solid earnest way in which he made sacrifices, real and practical ones, to duty, in his youth. Possessed of remarkable energy and decision of character, he never seems to have attained his exact sphere. Not educated for the ministry, we find him taking up position after position, of which, as it seems, the labour and excitement in one case was a mere exchange for labour and excitement in another. To a parish, and to ordinary common-place duties, he never settled down; he could not manage details, nor work himself into precision, and, as we should judge, definiteness. To use one of Alexander Knox's distinctions, he was always 'a foundation-man.' This we say merely as the moral result of the biography; upon Mr. Bickersteth's doctrinal deficiency we are content to be silent. As a work of art, compression would benefit Mr. Birks' two volumes;—the life is not full of incident, and the letters, though religiously worded, are not fruitful.

'Home is Home,' (Pickering,) is one of a class of fictions which we do not much admire. A family of an ordinary type is plunged into indescribable misfortunes; every member of it at once becomes heroic, practises every conceivable virtue, and is rewarded with a prodigality of riches and success which is quite embarrassing. The eldest daughter of course 'goes out as a governess,'—when is this insufferable platitude to cease?—and is fallen in love with by a young gentleman, who turns out to be somebody's 'long-lost son,' with uncountable thousands per annum; though why one of his recommendations should be that he is a Clergyman—seeing that throughout three hundred pages he never says or does the slightest clerical thing—we are at wonder. Then there is a faithful Irish servant—and two fashionable misses, whose function it is to insult the governess—a baronet, large-parked and Elizabethan-mansioned—boys all frankness, girls all maidenliness—a cross elderly gentleman, who is not cross, but who only for a purpose makes believe to be cross. If these not novel ingredients still please, 'Home is Home' will not want friends.

A metrical 'Record of the Exeter Synod,' (Masters,) exhibits kind feelings.

'Scudamore's Letters to a Seceder to Romanism,' (Rivingtons,) exhibit the popular argument in a manageable compass. The compilation is neat and useful; not the less so for being informal.

'England before the Norman Conquest,' (Van Voorst,) is quite a pattern of a simple history of a most unpromising period made readable and attractive.

'Rural Thoughts and Scenes,' (Masters,) always reach, and sometimes exceed, the average of fair poetry. A reverential and excellent spirit characterises the writer, Mr. Whiting.

Miss Corner's 'History of Greece,' (Dean,) is an excellent school-book; it works up the results of the larger historians, Grote and Thirlwall.

'Tales of the Empire,' by Mr. Baines, is one among many pleasant little books which Mr. Masters supplies for the transition state between the

nursery, and the larger, library. The 'House of Hapsburg' is less known to our young people than its romantic annals deserve.

A systematical and orderly ruled book to assist the work of parochial visiting has been prepared by Mr. A. D. Hilton. It is published under the title of 'The Pastor Visiting,' (Mozleys,) but it equally suits District Visitors, and cannot but be very useful. Method and order may supersede, but are never inconsistent with, higher gifts.

'Christ in Hades,' a poem, by W. W. Lord, (Appleton,) is really a remarkable work. It bears much the same relation to Milton that a very good prize-poem does to a classic. This is high praise; and what, as we should conceive, the author, an American, aims at. He has quite caught the Miltonic cadence and manner. By quoting the Athanasian Creed in Greek, does Mr. Lord imagine that to have been its original form?

Mr. Bennett's 'Last Sermons preached at St. Paul's and St. Barnabas,' (Cleaver,) will be much valued by those to whom they were addressed. They have also relations, though not so intimate, towards others: and it is never without distress that we can look back at the unhappy circumstances which deprived Mr. Bennett of a sphere of usefulness in which, although he might have faults of manner or temper, he was unquestionably a very great and successful worker. No church in the world can endure a system which proscribes angularities, or even self-sufficiencies, in character. We do not say that Mr. Bennett had such faults of temper; but taking him at his enemies' estimate, he and his people were hardly dealt with.

Mr. Armitstead's 'Parochial Papers,' (J. H. Parker,) have been collected into a volume; they cannot be neglected by those who seek to *work* their parishes.

'The Monthly Packet,' (Mozleys,) has completed its second volume. Far in literary powers beyond its compeers, more readable—we speak typographically as well as æsthetically—than the stiff type of Church Magazines to which we have been accustomed, it is emphatically *the* volume for the school library and for ordinary 'lending' purposes. All this we say not disparaging useful compeers, the 'Penny Post,' and the 'Church Sunday School Magazine,' which reaches us in its fifth volume. Economically—we only put it on this ground—there is a great waste of skill, material, and capital, in these competing serials.

The occasion of Mr. Warren's 'The Lily and the Bee,' (Blackwood,) having passed away, it will be well for that clever writer's reputation that the remembrance of this grotesque performance should pass away with it.

Mr. W. E. Heygate has carefully worked up a good deal of pious feeling and practical maxims from ascetic and devotional writers, in a series of sermons, 'Care of the Soul,' (Rivingtons,) which cannot fail to be useful. It is a volume fit for private study and practice; and the matter is, we think, superior to the form. The subject, especially as here treated, is hardly level to congregational capacities.

Catechising, like poetry, is rather to be done than to be taught. Assum-

ing, however, that it is a matter of instruction, Mr. Gooch's 'Church Catechism Expanded,' (Longman,) being sound, is in the right direction.

There is a great deal of thought and research in Mr. Westcott's 'Elements of the Gospel Harmony,' (Macmillan,) so much, that it would be premature to do more than to announce in this writer a vigorous and original mind, which deserves and will command attention.

A small volume on the 'Exercise of Faith,' (Philadelphia: Hooker,) is on the relation between authority and private judgment. Though the writer does not prefer claims to originality, yet he has succeeded in producing a very compact synopsis of the argument; one, it is needless to say, difficult on either side. The author, Mr. Mahan, has recently succeeded to the post in the Theological Seminary, vacated by the death of the respected Dr. Ogilby; and we certainly deem this volume a good omen of his academical success.

'The Spirit and Scope of Education, translated from the German of Dr. Stapf,' (Edinburgh: Marsh and Beattie,) is a Roman Catholic work. If read, however, by a thoughtful and judicious person—and it is eminently unfitted for the young—it cannot but do good. Works on the art of teaching, *didaktik* as the Germans call it, are rare, and proportionately valuable among us. The work before us is systematic and accurate.

Mr. C. E. Kennaway's 'Short Sermons on the Lord's Prayer,' (Brighton: Folthorp,) are simple and calm in tone.

Mr. J. H. Parker has published a neat edition of 'Pascal's Thoughts on Religion.'

Some curious 'Letters and Papers illustrating the early Reformation History of the Irish Church,' (Rivingtons,) have been edited by Mr. Evelyn Shirley. These bones and sinews of history have been too much neglected in the sister country; nor, indeed, among ourselves have we been so careful as we might have been. Strype wants both correction and illustration from the State Paper Office, and from contemporary documents, of which his gleanings are very scanty.

Mr. Currey's 'Hulsean Lectures for 1851,' (Deighton,) we thought more popular; but—perhaps not, on that account, less locally useful—than the general cast of academic discourses. The extent of the subject, 'The Evangelical Preparation, as exhibited in the History of the Israelites,' produces a condensed treatment; it is a subject which is probably too vague and extensive for a single publication.

We consider Mr. Foulkes' 'Manual of Ecclesiastical History,' (J. H. Parker,) quite a landmark to students. It supplies, and that satisfactorily, a need which had become quite an opprobrium among us. While it has the precision, it is without the barrenness of an index. Mr. Foulkes draws to scale, and we have none of the wearisome disquisition and apparatus which generally disfigures even elementary historical works. When his mind is made up, the author's result is set plainly and never officiously before his

reader. Mr. Foulkes is candid, yet not compromising; and without falling into boldness, a sufficient general conspectus of the Church life of an era is gained without any scene-painting or hero portraits. The present is, merely a composition, a favourable specimen of the 'Hand-book.' At present, Mr. Foulkes has only attained the conclusion of the twelfth century; but his industry, research, and good principles, augur well for the difficult periods which await him.

Two little books of Bishop Hall, 'The Occasional Meditations,' and 'The Meditations and Vows,' have been prettily reprinted by Pickering, in that pleasant tall 12mo. form, which was once popular. Apart from their beauty, they have higher merits—distinct, we mean, from their style. In Hall affectation did not exclude earnestness; and a quibble was not inconsistent with piety; indeed, the formal artificial style is one resource of a deep spiritualism. The good old Bishop's speech on the Canons of 1640, is, like those Canons, singularly perplexed, and only not mischievous because unpractical.

Mr. Appleyard—known, and when known valued, for his dutiful contributions to the cause of Christian union—has taken to the historical line in a small volume of 'Welch Sketches,' (Darling,) concerned, of course, with the Church of the Principality. The work is equal to the writer's reputation.

The Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn is, as everybody knows, the authoress of certain novels and travels, which have not gained her a high moral reputation. She has lately become a Roman Catholic, never having, except from the fact of her baptism, been a Christian. On her conversion she published *selon les règles*, a tract, 'From Babylon to Jerusalem,' and subsequently, 'Jerusalem;' the former narrating her journey to the Heavenly City—as she deems it—the latter describing her satisfaction and peace in her new calling. Dr. Nitsch, it is said, has taken up the matter in a little book, 'Babylon and Jerusalem,' which has been translated and published by J. W. Parker; and a very remarkable book it is; the writer is a Protestant, and his Protestantism is ultra-subjective and verging to what we should call Arnoldism. But his fair and candid estimate of the two systems—his evident yearnings for union—his free and generous acknowledgment of Protestant deficiencies and shortcomings—coupled, however, with an intense intellectual and critical denial of the *unum necessarium* of a sacramental system—for it comes to this—make the book a very remarkable one. And with respect to the writer's moral and literary capacities, a generous and untaunting tone is clothed in language vigorous and expressive.

It is a comfort to find so many publications of a practical kind meeting us at every quarter. We have on a single branch of pastoral work to specify:—1. Mr. Mould's 'Order for the Visitation of the Sick,' together with Psalms and Lessons.' (Rivingtons.) Good, but scarcely needed in presence of the '*Visitatio Infirmorum*.' 2. 'Lectures for Sick Persons,' (Hatchard,) by Mr. Bacon. Pious and touching, but far exceeded by a

work which, though we have already announced it, cannot be too much praised. 'Sickness: its Trials and Blessings,' (Rivingtons,) by one who has learned that blessedness of affliction which she so touchingly teaches. 3. Mr. French Laurence has also provided 'Services for the Sick,' (Vincent,) on the usual model. All these works are good, and all useful; and if they are all used, as they will be used, to good, we may pardon their variety.

Bp. Pearson's 'Lectures on the Acts and Annals of S. Paul,' (Rivingtons,) have been printed separately by Mr. Crowfoot, for academical purposes.

Mr. Robert Montgomery has sent us two ornamented volumes: one a selection from his poetry, under the title 'Lyra Christiana,' (Bell,) the other a 'Manual for Mourners'—in green and gold, by the way—'The Church of the Invisible,' (Darling.) Mr. Montgomery, we observe, follows a fashion of Archbishop Whately, that of quoting himself largely.

'A Gift at Confirmation,' (Rivingtons,) is a selection of religious poetry of all ages, schools, styles, and excellences, not always, we should have thought, especially suitable for Confirmation. It has, of course, some very excellent things: but such a religious 'Groves of Blarney' as it presents—Herbert, Keble, Lope de Vega, Barnaby Barnes, Longfellow, Toplady, Milton, Baxter, Lyte, Reading (the town, not the participle) Psalms, *cum multis aliis, &c.*

Mrs. Robert Wilson has printed a pretty collection of 'Poems,' (Masters,) of which the longest, on 'New Zealand,' exhibits taste and feeling.

A series of works, antithetically called 'Small Books on Great Subjects,' is in course of publication by Mr. Pickering. Several are 'upon the Early History of the Church:' and the last volume is 'on the State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity.' They are written with care, and with a precision which at least verges on affectation: Constantine is always Constantinus; Marseilles is Marseille (why not Massilia?); if Paul of Samosata is not Paulus, the Arians are Areians, and Nice is Nikaia. We should be unfair to the writer of the volume before us, were we to deny him the credit of a clear, but ambitious style, some research and considerable confidence. Besides this, he has the unquestionable talent of generalizing rapidly, and of condensing into a sufficiently life-like picture the characteristics of a period of society. But we are bound to say that the whole tone is dangerous; and is pointedly directed against the very existence of dogmatic truth. The articles of the Creed are formally impugned: *ex. grat.* 'The word λόγος is used to express that Divine manifestation whom we call Christ.' (P. 108, n.) 'The body and blood of Christ, namely, a corporeal capability of existence with him in a state of higher perfection.' (P. 120, n.) At p. 130, the whole idea of redemption is refined into a metaphor. At p. 133, it is denied that in the early Church 'infants were supposed to have in them any inherent, or birth, sin, which required to be washed away the moment they were born into the world by the cleansing water of baptism.'

'The Botanical Looker-out among Wild Flowers,' (Hamilton,) by Mr. Edwin Lees, is a graceful and pleasant country-book. We could have spared the poetry.

Mr. Henry Hayman's '*Dialogues on the Early Church*,' (Skeffington,) exhibit the reading of a scholar, and the style of a student of taste. Artistic and elaborate as sketches of a state of society which we only know by scattered literary notices, must perhaps, from the nature of the case, be, yet we recognise in this volume right feelings and sentiments on matters of doctrine, as well as considerable powers in detail.

In Mr. Mackenzie Walcott's work on '*the English Ordinal*,' (Rivingtons,) we find a systematic and laborious treatise, vindicating fully the 'validity and catholicity' of our Orders. It is, we trust, likely to be made an indispensable in the preparation of candidates for Holy Orders: and it fully deserves every recommendation which we can give. The references and reading are full and extensive.

If we cannot accord to Mr. Palin's '*History of the Church of England from the Restoration to the silencing of Convocation*,' (Rivingtons,) much merit as an historical composition, we must do it the justice of saying that it displays good principles and intention, and not a little undigested reading. Mr. Palin is not judicious, but he is earnest: a finer specimen of good hearty abuse of Burnet, disparagement of Macaulay, and dislike of Lord Campbell, it would be hard to conceive. Scotland, Scotch writers, and Scotch religion, are not appreciated at Stifford. Occasionally our author displays a rough wit, as when he likens William the Conqueror, second of that class, to a monster with a Tudor head and a Presbyterian body. As a literary composition, we cannot say much for Mr. Palin's work: but there are useful things in it; though we are constrained to say that the absence of anything like critical power will prevent its author taking rank as an historian.

Although Mr. Whitaker Churton belongs to a different theological school from ourselves, we cannot refuse him the credit of having produced in his '*Land of the Morning*,' (Hatchard,) an elegant and religious work on the East, slightly but not unpleasantly imbued with sentimentalism. Mr. Churton seems to have preserved—a difficult matter—the character of an English clergyman throughout his pilgrimage: a thoroughly religious character pervades all that he says and does.

Mr. Kerchever Arnold has added to his reputation and usefulness, by his '*First Hebrew Book*,' (Rivington.)

'*The Literature of Italy*,' by Mr. Leonard Simpson, (Bentley,) is an agreeable sketch. The title is ambitious, and should have been restricted. It reaches to the death of Boccaccio; and is strictly an account of the rise of the Italian language.

The late Mr. Ward's '*Oxford University Statutes*,' (Pickering,) has been completed in a second volume, edited by Mr. Heywood. It has taken a miscellaneous aspect, containing a good deal of which the title hardly holds

out a promise: such as the proceedings in Mr. Ward's degradation, and Dr. Symonds's Election.

'*De Ecclesiasticæ Britonum Scotorumque historiæ fontibus*,' (Berolini: Hertz,) is an Essay by C. W. Schoell. The author has produced a neat and clear dissertation on the older historians, Gildas and Bede: and in the latter division of his subject, as it is superfluous to observe, he notices the early Irish annals, and the life of S. Patrick. It is a creditable and exact performance.

Mr. Cockerell has drawn up, and Mr. J. H. Parker, with all the advantages of his luxurious typography, has published a very handsome volume on the 'Iconography of the West Front of Wells Cathedral.' It is sumptuously illustrated. We cannot in this place criticise the conjectural restorations: but Mr. Cockerell has bestowed very great pains, and has collected a great amount of curious illustrative learning on his subject. It is written in an admirable tone: and the principle of Ecclesiastical sculpture ornament is successfully vindicated. Besides his main subject, the history and excellence of English art is proved: and at least in this particular, a successful rivalry is shown, even with the best period of Italian work. In an Appendix, Mr. Cockerell points out the great iconic annals—one form of national poetry—which, in ruins, are still preserved in the English Cathedrals. Flaxman, it is to be remembered, had preceded Mr. Cockerell in his estimate of the artistic value of the Wells statues.

'The Second Part of the New Testament—the Epistles and the Revelation—expounded,' (Longman,) by Mr. Clement Moody, is on the plan of transcribing in full, as foot-notes, the passages which are referred to in the ordinary marginal references. It is a handsome quarto volume.

True to an ancestral fame, Mr. George Hay Forbes recalls the great Bishop of Edinburgh, and Forbes of Corse, in his small but learned essay, 'The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist,' (Lendrum.) The theology of the author of the *Considerationes Modestæ*, of Mede, and Johnson, are here illustrated chiefly by the writings of the Fathers of the first four centuries; all this, it is needless to say, for the sake of vindicating—or as it seems preserving—the Scotch Eucharistic office. There are painful circumstances in the recent history of the Scotch Church which invest this work with peculiar interest and importance. We find the present pamphlet, for it scarcely exceeds a pamphlet, marked Part the Second; we never saw—for we are not likely to have forgotten—its predecessor.

Mr. Whitaker's Almanacs, published by Mr. J. H. Parker, we recommend as models of accuracy and completeness. 'The Family Almanac' tells everything on schools and colleges needful, and the information is complete to those who have anything to do with teaching or learning. 'Whitaker's Clergyman's Diary' tells its own tale and answers its own promise.

Μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν. If Mr. Franke Parker has acquired the dignity of the former, we must relieve him from the indignity of the latter characteristic. In his 'The Church,' (J. H. Parker,) we find copious and important chronological tables—a chart of writers—synopses of doctrine

and history—dissertations on such questions as the inspiration, authenticity, genuineness, &c., of Scripture, and a vast amount of information and research. The fault of the work, artistically, is its aim; it takes too large a sweep. Mr. Parker is not content with less than everything; he begins at the beginning, and seeks to exhaust, explain, and analyse all history—from the Creation to Mr. Gorham—from natural religion down to the desirableness of a Clergyman farming his own glebe; nothing escapes his portentous net of facts; cosmogony, and the last ‘Morning Chronicle’ and ‘Guardian’ find themselves grouped in the same volume, which, as we have said, is, as indeed it need be, no small one. Mr. Parker is occasionally fanciful, as when he detects some symbolism in Sir Joseph Paxton’s large glass-house, which he connects with the seventh Millenary. And we are at a decided issue with him in identifying ‘Baptism by laics’ with the mystery of the Apocalyptic Beast. But, abating some extravagancies, and a total inappreciation of writing to scale and symmetry, Mr. Parker’s is a book of great erudition and usefulness.

Two valuable works have reached us, to the truthfulness of which we are glad to add our own testimony; one, and the most important, is Mr. Meyrick’s ‘Practical Working of the Church in Spain.’ (J. H. Parker.) This is the experience—and it is the experience of every Spanish traveller—of a thoughtful person, as to the lamentable results of unchecked Romanism. Mr. James Meyrick left England, we will not say with Rome-ward tendencies, but with a very vivid appreciation of our own ecclesiastical defects. Others have done the same, and with the same result; which is, that there are great evils and scandals in foreign systems, the same in kind as those under which we suffer, and often far greater in degree. Here is the solid substantial fact: Spain is divided between ultra infidelity and what is so closely akin to actual idolatry, that it can only be controversially, not practically, distinguished from it. And over all hangs a lurid cloud of systematic immorality simply frightful to contemplate. Poor Blanco White’s history can never be appreciated without some personal knowledge of Spain. We can offer a direct, and even personal, testimony, to all that Mr. Meyrick has to say.—The other, in some respects kindred, work, Mr. Debary’s ‘Notes of a Residence in the Canary Islands, Spain, and Algiers,’ (Rivingtons,) is of the same character; less full, and, consequently, less direct. The writer, as far as he goes, has observed accurately; but his sketches are not very elaborate. Mr. Debary has certainly bridled any tendencies towards extravagance or romanticism; never surely has any traveller stood under the shadow of the Peak of Tenerife—not Teneriffe—and traversed earth’s sweetest spot, the Valley of Orotava, with less display of enthusiasm than the present writer. The press has been strangely corrected: *carpa* for *capa*.

Mr. Vaux’s ‘Hand-book to the Antiquities of the British Museum,’ (Murray,) is condensed, yet not superficial; and it adds the precision of a catalogue to the refinement of a critical essay.

Mr. Murray has recently published, under the general title, ‘Reading for the Rail,’ a collection of works which cannot but be popular. They are

entirely, we believe, reprints: Essays from 'The Times,' which deserve a more permanent place; Essays from the 'Quarterly,' at present not ranging beyond Nimrod's brilliant trilogy, 'The Road,' 'The Chase,' and 'The Turf;' 'Æsop's Fables,' beautifully illustrated by Tenniel, and a condensed reprint of 'Layard's Nineveh.' The mixed character of the series is a good feature: price, size, subject, all are suited to the various exigencies of grave, gay, lively, and severe; the notion is good, and carried out with vigour and discernment. May we suggest a sprinkling of poetry in the series? Tastes vary; but to ourselves, a volume of poems, which permits, or requires the eye to be frequently withdrawn from the page, and which suggests mental picture-drawing, and consequently compels but little of mechanical effort, is *the* reading for the rail.

It were disrespectful to Mr. Maurice—may we add to ourselves?—to dismiss his 'Nineteen Sermons on the Old Testament,' (J. W. Parker,) in a single paragraph. A short notice would not comprise all that we have to say on the subject; and to notice only a single aspect of Mr. Maurice's principle, would be eminently unfair. As it is, therefore, we say nothing; feeling, at any rate, that Mr. Maurice has acquired name enough not to make delay, in his case, an injustice.

Mr. Peter Holmes has already printed the first part of his work on 'Diocesan Synods.' (J. H. Parker.) It is very full and learned; the research and industry displayed are as creditable to the writer as his good faith and feeling are conspicuous. When completed, the book will be an important addition to our documentary history.—Connected with this subject, is the useful paper read at the Derby Meeting on Synods, by Mr. Wm. Pound, 'The Ancient Practice of Diocesan Synods in England.' (Hatchard.) Mr. Pound deserves, and has gained, great sympathy for his earnestness in this cause.

Still turning westward—and a more important testimony to the value of its great Bishop's labours cannot be found than in the number and value of the publications which we receive from the Diocese of Exeter—we have to introduce Chancellor Harington's clear, full, and convincing 'Letter on the LV. Canon,' &c. (Rivingtons.) By anticipation, if we remember right, it refutes Mr. Goode's view of the Scotch Church, A.D. 1604; and the cases of Whittingham and Travers are very ably discussed by the Exeter dignitary. Mr. Harington never touches a subject which he does not exhaust; and this is one peculiarly suited to his literature and style. We call especial attention to the masterly vindication of Bramhall. On the miserable Gawthorn matter, in which the discussion originated, we can announce an early publication from the Bishop of Exeter himself.

A further 'Appeal for the formation of Church Penitentiaries,' (J. H. Parker,) is authenticated by Mr. Armstrong, of Tidenham. It will be familiar to our readers as having appeared from time to time in the 'Morning Chronicle,' and the beauty and impressiveness of the language, as well as the importance of the subject, attracted considerable notice. Mr. Armstrong has long identified himself with this great work of mercy; and it is satis-

factory to know that it is now taken up in the right—that is, the practical—spirit.

On the Education subject we have to mention—1. Archdeacon Denison's 'Reply to the Promoters of the Manchester and Salford Scheme.' (Masters.) This is a full and complete *résumé* of the vigorous Archdeacon's fugitive letters, appeals, and protests. We consider it the manual on the subject; and it is ably and systematically written. 2. 'Socinianism the unavoidable result of the Manchester and Salford Scheme,' by Mr. Newland, (Batty,) who has reaped laurels in the same field. 3. 'Church Education the only Education in which the Clergy may take any part,' (Batty,) which is true in a sense. 4. 'Education the Necessity of Mankind.' A sermon—and something more—by Archdeacon Hare, (J. W. Parker,) in which he vigorously and kindly vindicates Mr. Woodard's schools at Shoreham and Hurstpierpoint.

Of practical works, the most important is 'Stories and Catechisings on the Collects,' a new series of Tracts by Mr. W. Jackson, (Mozleys.) Ingenious in plan—successful in execution—correct in doctrine—cheap in price—without being familiar, they escape dullness—they are lively, yet religious. The series cannot but succeed.

From America we have received—1. A remarkable Sermon by Dr. Crossey, of New York, 'The Position and Safeguards of the Church.' New circumstances require new remedies; and, as far as we can realize the condition of our sister communion, requiring, as it does, such opposite exhibitions of truth, we can quite understand the value of a sermon so large in its views as the present. 2. Bishop Doane's 'Second Baccalaureate Address;' vigorous, fresh, and striking; the amiable writer's short, quick, emphatic, half-sentences, are like the hasty summons to arms. 3. 'Register of the College of S. James, Maryland, U.S.' This is the institution which is so successful under Mr. Kerfoot's care. By the way, we should like to know why American academics of the second year are called 'Sophomores?' what is the jest? Among ourselves, the seniority is about equivalent to that of *Generalis Sophista*. But Sophomore? what especial accession of folly to wisdom characterises this period of Transatlantic undergraduateship?

'Thoughts for the Medical Student, addressed on the Opening of the Twentieth Session of King's College,' by Dr. Bowman, (J. W. Parker,) speaks well of the institution which encourages so religious a treatment of the medical faculty.

Mr. Bowdler's 'Thoughts on Confession and Absolution,' (Rivingtons,) are very high in tone and careful in discrimination. 'The one main cause that the faithful carrying out of the principles and requirements of our Church is denounced as of a Romish or Romanizing character, is, that we of the Clergy have neglected to stir up the gift that is in us by the putting of on of hands.' (P. 17.)

While we are at press, two works reach us of sufficient interest and importance to warrant us in undertaking to give them fuller notice in our next number—a new and enlarged edition of Mr. Caswall's standard work on the 'American Church,' (Mozleys,) and Mr. Isaac Williams 'On the Apocalypse.' (Rivingtons.)

'The Truth about Rome,' (Houlston and Stoneman,) is certainly a new view: not only was not S. Peter Bishop of Rome, but he never was at Rome at all—further, he never was in Europe; and still further, not only were SS. Peter and Paul not martyred in Rome, but were never martyred. A proof that they never existed would, perhaps, have been simpler. The writer, an ingenious person, in a previous tract, 'Faith and Infidelity,' (Hatchard,) published in 1848, had thought proper to fix the fall of the Papacy in 1850—in the present work, 1851, p. 90, he quietly requests the readers of the 'Faith and Infidelity,' for 'A.D. 1850,' to read 'A.D. 1866.'

'The Planting of Nations a great Responsibility,' (Bell,) is the Bishop of Oxford's 'Jubilee Sermon,' preached at S. Mary's for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. It is written with all the distinguished writer's vigour and eloquence, and must have told in its delivery.

Of Sermons, and the like, we have to mention, and with approval—1. Mr. Huxtable's, preached at Wells, on the 'Use of Sponsors,' (Rivingtons.) 2. 'Two Addresses on Independence and Submission,' delivered at Harrow, by Dr. Vaughan, (J. W. Parker.) 3. By Mr. Rowland Williams, at the Visitation of Bishop of St. David's, to which is added, a Sermon at Lampeter, together with one of the most vigorous, plain-spoken, and severe *brochures* we have lately met with, 'A Defence of Lampeter College,' (J. W. Parker.) 4. Mr. Pearson's 'Visitation Sermon at Guildford,' (Masters.) 5. Dr. Hook's 'Duty of English Churchmen,' embodying a pleasing account of his stewardship at Leeds, (Murray.) 6. Which has attracted much attention, Bishop Fulford's remarkable 'Pastoral Letter,' (Rivingtons,) exposing the miserable proceedings of the Church and Colonial School Society. 7. 'Praise a Duty in the Church's Adversity,' by Mr. T. W. Perry. (J. H. Parker.)

P. S. Since the Article on 'Jansenism' was worked off, we have been informed by the Archbishop of Utrecht, that a third edition of the Abbé Bellegarde's History of that Church (to which we have already referred) is in the press, and will be rendered more valuable by a continuation to the present time. We have great pleasure in directing attention to the advertisement of this book. It is a work which relates, in an interesting style, and with great conciseness, all that the ordinary reader needs to be informed of the past history, and present condition, of the National Church of Holland.—In the same article, p. 110, line 18, for Cardinal Thomasius read Louis Thomassin.

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1852.

ART. I.—1. *Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine. Par M. HUC, Prêtre Missionnaire de la Congrégation de Saint Lazare.* Paris: Le Clere et Comp^{ie}. 1850.

2. *Eastern Monachism: an Account of the Origin, Laws, Discipline, Sacred Writings, Mysterious Rites, Religious Ceremonies, and Present Circumstances, of the Order of Mendicants founded by Gôtama Budha, (compiled from Singhalese MSS. and other original sources of Information;) with comparative Notices of the Usages and Institutions of the Western Ascetics, and a Review of the Monastic System.* By R. SPENCE HARDY, Member of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. London: Partridge & Oakey. 1850.

OF the above two books the first is the one which will furnish the basis of the present article; it is one of the most amusing which we have seen for a long time. It opens a new subject, and lays it before the reader with a vivacity and fulness of detail, which at once makes him at home with all the scenes and personages through which the travellers passed, and fixes in his mind a clear and life-like picture of Tartar, Chinese, and Thibetan character and circumstances.

The writers are two French Lazaristes, who in the year 1844 started from a small Christian settlement a little north of Pekin, in order to begin the conversion of the Tartars. Rounding the Great Wall, and the north of China, they worked their way through Mongol Tartary to Lassa, the capital of Thibet, which was their main object. After some stay in that city, they were sent back through the centre of Thibet and China to Macao, which they reached in the end of 1846. These two volumes give an account of their adventures from their first starting to the time when they reached the frontier of China on their return.

The men are admirably suited both for their task and for relating it. Quick and industrious in observation, shrewd in their estimate of character, graphic in their language, of inexhaustible good-humour, ardently loving the ups and downs of travel, not only for their object, but for their own sake, and keenly alive to the ridiculous, whether in others or in their own persons and misadventures, they would have been the very models of travelling companions; while a vein of stronger interest is kept up by their unaffected piety, breaking forth freely, though not obtrusively, in touching thoughts, and proved by a long course of self-denying and courageous action. They are Frenchmen all over—French in their dexterous politeness, their promptitude and courage under difficulty, their ready perception and use of an advantage, their cheerfulness under fatigue and disappointment—their contentment with their ordinary spare diet of oatmeal dipped into milkless and sometimes cold tea, and the well-earned satisfaction which they evince when able to vary that diet with the rare fish of the Hoang-Ho, or the exquisite rolls of Koun-boum—the hares of Tchogorten, or the delicate cookery of Lassa—French in the tinge of imaginative exaggeration which pervades their apprehension of things—French finally in the keen recollection that they *are* French, which leads them with some *naïveté* to appropriate to their country all the inventions of modern Europe, and to congratulate themselves that after a month in the metropolis of Thibet, they had taught its numerous inhabitants ‘to speak with respect’ and admiration of the holy doctrine of Jehovah and the great ‘kingdom of France.’

Their little caravan consisted of three camels, a white horse, and a black mule, on the last of which was mounted their only servant, Samdadchiemba, of a cross-breed race called Dchiaour, combining, says M. Huc, in some degree, ‘the frank simplicity of the Tartar, the mischievous trickery of the Chinese, and ‘the dauntless energy of the Thibetan,’—a man of great personal strength, a dogged and capricious temper, and unshaken fidelity, with a Christianity very sincere, though considerably perplexed by the remnant of his Buddhist superstitions.

We shall endeavour to bring together such extracts from their ‘recollections’ as shall illustrate first the character and relations of the Tartar, Chinese, and Thibetan, and next, the singular phenomena of the Buddhist religion, which is, in a measure, common to them all, and, in spite of Mr. Spence Hardy’s counter-statement, is the present witness through that great tract of country to the being of an Almighty God, and the duty of obeying His commands by loving Him, and our neighbour. As however we are writing not a treatise, but an article, we

shall not hesitate to sacrifice order and logical method to the amusement of our readers, whenever we are tempted out of our course by an unusually attractive extract.

The missionaries commenced their journey from a little village on the borders of Mongol-Tartary, where a small knot was collected of Chinese Christians, driven from China by persecution. Their first step, after attaining a knowledge of the Mongol language, and translating two or three religious books, was to cut off their hair, and adopt the yellow dress which has been rendered famous by the proceedings of Lord Torrington. This, with a forethought which was entirely justified by the result, they considered of the first necessity for their undertaking. It is the secular, or every day dress of the Lama, or Budhist priest, by which that large class is at once distinguished from the laity, or, as they are called by the Tartars, the *black men*. There is something whimsical in the satisfaction which M. Huc expresses at finding himself once more in a priestly costume, a forbidden luxury in China. But it was also a material advantage. A 'black man' who dogmatized about religion would be laughed at by the Tartars; but the yellow dress enabled the missionaries at once to take a religious tone with their chance companions, and commanded their attention and reverence. This reverence was always enhanced when the missionaries themselves announced themselves as Lamas of the west, (*du ciel d'occident*), from which the Tartars imagine all religious knowledge to radiate. And to anticipate any charge of fraud, we should add, strange as it may appear, that this reverence was never diminished when the missionaries explained, as they always did, that this 'western heaven' was not that of the sacred city of Lassa, but a more distant and unknown country; and that the strangers were not Lamas of Budha, but of Him who is known in China as 'Jehovah,'—'the Lord of heaven.' But of this we shall have to say more hereafter; meanwhile we cannot begin the account of their travels more appropriately than by their own description of the country in which they were launched on leaving China.

'We had never passed through a finer country in finer weather. The desert is often frightful and horrible; but sometimes it possesses charms of its own; charms the more felt as they are rarer and unknown to inhabited countries. Tartary has a wholly peculiar aspect; nothing else in the world resembles a district of Tartary. In civilized countries, you meet at every step populous cities, high and varied cultivation, the thousand products of art and industry, the incessant bustle of trade. You feel as if driven before an immense whirlwind. In savage countries, you find primæval forests, with all the pride of their exuberant and gigantic vegetation; your mind is oppressed beneath the power and majesty of nature. Tartary resembles neither. There are no cities, no buildings, no arts, no industry, no cultivation, no forests. Always and everywhere there is but a great

prairie, sometimes broken by immense lakes, majestic rivers, bold and imposing mountains; sometimes opening out into illimitable plains. Then, when you find yourself in this green wilderness, bounded only by a distant horizon, you might fancy yourself on the ocean in calm weather. The view of the prairies of Mongolia excites neither joy nor sorrow; but rather a mixture of both—a melancholy and religious feeling, which gradually elevates the soul without making it wholly lose sight of things below; a feeling in which there is more of heaven than of earth, not unsuitable to the nature of an intelligent being informed by bodily senses.

‘But sometimes you fall upon scenes of greater life and movement. It is when a numerous tribe has been attracted by the goodness of the water and of the pastures. Then tents of every size may be seen rising on every side, like inflated balloons on the point of springing into the air. The children, with baskets on their backs, crawl hither and thither to hunt for the *argols*¹ which are piled round the tent. The mothers run after the young calves, boil the tea in the open air, or prepare the milk, while the men, mounted on fiery horses, and armed with a long pole, gallop in every direction, to guide into the choicest pastures the vast flocks which float and undulate in the distance, like the waves of the sea. Often, however, these animated pictures suddenly disappear, and nothing is seen where lately there was so much life. Men, tents, flocks, all seem to have vanished in a moment. You see nothing in the desert but heaps of ashes, half-extinguished fires, a few bones over which the birds of prey are quarrelling—the only traces which tell that the nomad Mongol has passed the day before. The reason of these sudden migrations, is only this—the animals have consumed the grass which covered the ground; the chief has therefore given the signal of departure, and all the shepherds have rolled up their tents; they have driven their flocks before them, and are gone to seek, it matters not where, new and fresher pastures.’—Vol. i. pp. 58–60.

Yet in these vast solitudes it is not uncommon to meet with the remains of large and fortified cities, now entirely deserted, and half buried by the accumulation of soil, singular and anomalous records of a state of things which has wholly passed away. It is conjectured from the Chinese records that they rose about

¹ *Argols*, which form a very prominent feature in Tartar life, and consequently in M. Huc's book, are the dung of animals which form the only fuel of these countries. The following is an extract from his account of a day in the desert:—‘L'exercice qui suivait la méditation n'était pas, il faut en convenir, un exercice mystique; mais pourtant, il était très-nécessaire, et ne laissait pas d'avoir aussi ses charmes. Chacun prenait un sac sur son dos, et nous allions de côté et d'autre à la recherche des argols. Ceux qui n'ont jamais mené la vie nomade, comprendront difficilement que ce genre d'occupation soit susceptible d'être accompagné de jouissances. Pourtant, quand on a la bonne fortune de rencontrer, caché parmi les herbes, un argol recommandable par sa grosseur et sa siccité, on éprouve au cœur un petit frémissement de joie, une de ces émotions soudaines qui donnent un instant de bonheur. Le plaisir que procure la trouvaille d'un bel argol, est semblable à celui du chasseur, qui découvre avec transport les traces du gibier qu'il poursuit, de l'enfant qui regarde d'un œil pétillant de joie le nid de fauvette qu'il a longtemps cherché, du pêcheur qui voit fretille, suspendu à sa ligne, un joli poisson; et s'il était permis de rapprocher les petites choses des grandes, on pourrait encore comparer ce plaisir, à l'enthousiasme d'un Leverrier qui trouve une planète au bout de sa plume.’—Vol. i. pp. 240, 241.

There is a humorous honesty about this avowal which must not be despised by anybody who has ever hunted for mushrooms, fossils, or even blackberries.

the thirteenth, and were desolated by a Chinese invasion in the fourteenth century. But no tradition whatever remains on the spot of their origin, history, or abandonment.

The character of the tribes who wander over this strange country is in part the result of their mode of life. But they have their own characteristics. Like other pastoral nations they are ignorant and averse from any settled industry. Their life alternates between a lounging idleness and fits of violent exertion, an extravagant and childish gaiety, and a melancholy depression; and there is a corresponding inconsistency between their usual timidity and the courage and impetuosity which they show when animated by passion, religious fanaticism, or perhaps loyalty, and which, if we remember right, they did show in the Chinese war. Clumsy and repulsive in their exterior, they are in character kind, simple, credulous, and gossiping. They are loose in their morals, and 'like ill-educated children,' somewhat given to lay hands upon trifling articles that take their fancy. But they are not robbers, and sometimes show remarkable traits of honesty. They are very generous, unfailingly hospitable, gentle, obliging, true, and fervently religious.

The politeness which they share with the Chinese is sufficiently whimsical to deserve special illustration. Sometimes, indeed, it survives the more excellent qualities of benevolence and honesty. In spite of their general good character, there is a mountain called euphemistically 'the good mountain,' which is infested by brigands of the most ferocious kind. They rob and maltreat travellers in every possible way; sometimes they strip them naked and so leave them, sometimes they murder them. But their manners are unimpeachable. 'They presented themselves modestly,' says M. Huc, 'and then, "My good old elder brother, I am tired of walking; be kind enough to lend me thy horse. I have no money, be kind enough to lend me thy purse. It is very cold to-day, be kind enough to lend me thy coat." If the good old elder brother has charity enough to make the loan, they say, "Thank you, my brother;" if not, the humble request is forthwith enforced by the cudgel. If this too fails, they resort to the sabre.' Again, in the following ceremonial there is not probably much sterling value. The scene is laid in Tolon-Noor. The shop, we should say, is Chinese; but the population and manners are Tartar.

'We sat down, and forthwith a teapot was placed before each of us. It is the indispensable preliminary to every meal. Before eating a morsel, every one must drink a great deal, and that boiling. While you are thus distending yourself with tea, you receive the visit of the *intendant de la table*. He is usually a personage of elegant manners and inexhaustible volubility;

competent to discourse about all countries, and everybody's affairs. He ends, however, by asking your orders, and as you name your dishes, he proclaims them in a kind of chant for the information of the *gouverneur de marmite*. You are served with admirable despatch; but before beginning your repast, etiquette requires you to rise and invite the guests all round to join you. "Come! come all together," you cry, with corresponding gesticulations; "come drink a little wine, and eat a little rice." "Thanks! thanks!" answers the company; "rather come and sit down with us. It is for us to invite you." After this ceremonial, you have "manifested your honour," as they say in that country, and may take your meal as a gentleman of quality.

When you rise to depart, the *intendant de la table* reappears, and while you cross the room, he again chants forth the catalogue of dishes you have ordered, and concludes by proclaiming the total expense, in a loud and intelligible voice. You then go to the counter, and drop the money into the till.—Vol. i. pp. 38, 39.

But often it is otherwise. In the case of the simple nomad, the ceremonious politeness of the brigand or the waiter rises into benevolent courtesy. 'All men are brothers,' is a sentiment which is touchingly frequent on the thick lips of a Tartar shepherd, and it is generally followed by an act of substantial kindness. Whether the travellers have lost their way, or their camels, whether they are in search of *argols*, or of mutton, 'All men are brothers,' says the first Tartar whom they meet, and he turns out of his way to help them through. The following is pleasing. The Missionaries had offered a Tartar Lama their scales to weigh an ounce of silver which they had tendered in payment for a sheep.

'At these words the Lama stepped backwards, and throwing his hands towards us, cried out, "Above there is a heaven; below there is an earth, and Budha is the master of all things. He desires all men to treat each other as brothers. You are of the West; I am of the East. Is that any reason why our dealings should not be frank and true? You have not cheapened my mutton. I take your silver unweighed."—Vol. i. p. 340.

There is a thoroughly Eastern—almost a scriptural—simplicity in their openhearted and courteous hospitality.

"Seigneurs Lamas," said the old man, "all men are brothers; but dwellers in the tent are bound together like the flesh to the bone. Seigneurs Lamas, come and sit in my poor dwelling-place. The 15th of the month is a solemn day. You are strangers and travellers; you cannot this evening fill your place at the hearth of your noble family. Rest yourselves a few days among us; your presence will bring us peace and happiness."—Vol. i. p. 84.

Again, when they have lost their horses.

"Seigneurs Lamas," says the Mongol chief, "let not disquiet enter your hearts. Your animals cannot be lost. In these countries we have neither robbers nor accomplices of robbers. I will send to seek your horses. If they are not found, you shall choose from our droves those that will suit you best. We wish you to depart in peace as you came."—Vol. i. p. 99.

And straightway eight Tartar horsemen start in chase, and in an hour or two return in triumph with the missing animals. 'On their arrival,' says M. Huc, 'they told us, with the satisfaction of men who are relieved from a great anxiety, that in their country nobody ever lost anything.' It is true, that by a kind of Saxon law, a Tartar chief is bound to replace all the animals that are lost from a caravan while passing through his district. But the cheerfulness with which this law is obeyed by those who have the power in their hands is not the less remarkable.

The account of another rencontre will have a value for Englishmen besides what it possesses as an illustration of Tartar character. The missionaries had been drenched by a torrent of rain, and were absolutely without fuel—'not a branch, not a root was to be seen,' and as to *argols*, 'la pluie avait réduit en bouilli cet unique chauffage du desert.'

'We had resigned ourselves to our fate, and were on the point of supping upon a little flour soaked in cold water, when we saw two Tartars approach us, leading a small camel. After the usual greetings, one of them said, "Seigneurs Lamas, the heaven has come down to-day—doubtless, you cannot light your fire." "Alas! how can we light a fire without *argols*?" "All men are brothers, and should share together. But black men are bound to serve and honour the saints, and so we have come to light your fire." These good Tartars had seen us while we were seeking a resting-place, and anticipating our difficulty, had hastened to offer us two baskets of *argols*. We thanked God for this un-hoped-for help, and the Dchiahour at once began to prepare the flour for supper. The quantity was a little increased, in honour of our two guests.'—Vol. i. p. 52.

A conversation followed, in which it appeared, that one of the Tartars had been called out to serve against the English. His account of the war—refracted through Chinese rumours, though not to our present point, is too personally interesting to be omitted. The Kitat (Chinese) having been worsted by the enemy, and the Solon Tartars by the climate of the South, the Eight Banners of the Tchakar—the army of reserve of the Empire, to which our martialist belonged—were called out.

'Then the Great Master sent us his holy ordinance. Each ran instantly to the herds to get his best horse; we shook the dust from our bows and quivers; we rubbed the rust from our lances. In every tent sheep were killed to make the farewell feast. Our wives and children wept; but we spoke to them the words of reason. For six generations, said we, we have been receiving benefits from our holy Master, and he has asked nothing from us. Now that he has need of us, how can we draw back? He has given us the fine country of the Tchakar to feed our flocks in, and that we might at the same time defend him against the Khalkhas. Now since the rebels come from the south, we must march to the south. Are not these words, Seigneurs Lamas, reasonable? Yes! we had to march. The holy ordinance arrived at sunrise, . . . and the same day we began our march. . . . "Did you fight? Did you see the enemy?" asked Samdacheiamba. "No! he did not dare to appear. The Kitat kept repeating that we were going

to certain and useless death. 'What will you do,' they said, 'against sea-monsters? They live in the water like fish. When you least expect it, they rise to the surface, and shoot out melons of fire (shells); when you bend the bow at them they duck under water, like frogs.' Thus they tried to alarm us; but we soldiers of the Eight Banners were not to be frightened. Before our departure, the grand Lamas had opened the book of the heavenly secrets, and had assured us of a happy end to the enterprise. The Emperor had given to each Tchouanda a Lama learned in medicine, and in all the sacred omens; they were to cure us of the sicknesses of the climate, and to protect us from the sorcery of the sea monsters. What had we then to fear? The rebels, having heard that the invincible army of the Tchakar drew near, trembled and asked for peace. The holy Master, out of his immense mercy, granted it to them, and we returned to our pastures to watch over our flocks."—Vol. i. pp. 53—55.

Lord Gough and his army appear throughout to have been greatly beholden to Chinese mercy. The general opposed to them was the Batourou Yang, or Yang the Valorous—a man remarkable for his military successes, his great height, and the prodigious length of his beard. His tactics were at once simple and original. When the action commenced, he tied two great knots in his beard, to get it out of his way. Then he posted himself, sabre in hand, in the rear of his troops, and cut down without mercy all who attempted to retreat. M. Huc inquired of various Mandarins, how, by such tactics, he had failed to exterminate the English. All replied, 'that he had compassion on them.'

But to return. One defect in Tartar habits is too prominent to be left unnoticed—dirt. As the Homeric Ulysses is always crafty, Achilles swift, and the Achæans longhaired, so 'stinking' is the natural prefix which flows spontaneously from a Chinese mouth when he wishes to emphasize the word 'Tartar.' Their filth is astonishing, and, as might be expected, it is even more troublesome to strangers than to themselves. M. Huc complains feelingly of his sufferings from it. 'The lice were the greatest affliction which we had to endure throughout our long voyage. We have had to struggle and brace ourselves against hunger and thirst—against horrible cold and impetuous winds. Through two whole years—death by wild beasts—by robbers—by avalanches of snow—by mountain chasms—has never ceased, as I may say, to hover over our heads—yet all these dangers and trials have we regarded as nothing in comparison with that frightful vermin of which we often became the prey.' Under such circumstances, it may have been a heroic economy of ecclesiastical funds which reconciled the missionaries to adopt, from a Tartar slop-shop, two second-hand sheepskin coats, too short for the long M. Gabet, and too long for the short M. Huc. But we can recognise nothing but nastiness in the endurance, for a month and a half, of the same inner garments, unchanged

and unwashed, while daily sufferings of the most pungent kind, ' nous annonçaient assez que nos vêtements étaient peuplés de cette vermine immonde,' and when every halt (for the sake of the animals) was necessarily near a stream or well of water.

We have noticed that an indolent and confiding *bonhomme* is a distinguishing characteristic of the Tartar. It may be supposed that this renders him no match for the subtle, industrious, money-getting, and versatile Chinese, and he is accordingly plundered at every turn. The Tartar chiefs are swindled by the 'Holy Master,' whom they regard with such a touching loyalty. The people are devoured by Chinese usurers, retailers, and money-changers, and their pastures are continually encroached upon by Chinese agriculturists. The Chinese cultivator advances upon the nomad Mongol with various success; but on the whole as steadily as the American squatter upon the red Indian, or the English stockholder upon the migratory tribes of Australia. Introducing themselves as suppliants, they become first powerful, and then troublesome. At this stage of the proceeding, the Mongol is sometimes roused into resistance, and the invaders are expelled. But more frequently the Kitat extend their encroachments till they are able to maintain by force what they have gained by sufferance, and the Tartar is obliged to recede before civilization into less fertile and genial pastures. But this is nothing to the systematic pillage to which they are exposed in their money transactions. The commerce between the Tartar and Chinese is an organized iniquity. When a Mongol appears in a commercial town, he is seized upon by a knot of Chinese, who feast him, serve him, flatter him, and possibly make him drunk for days together, and conclude by disposing for him of all he has to sell, and buying for him all he wants to purchase. They not only make him pay two or three hundred per cent. on each transaction, but they contrive to send the poor man away, congratulating himself on the kind friend he has met, and determined to come back himself, and to send all his friends and relations to the same broker.

The description of the missionaries' entry into the 'Ville Bleue,' a town of this class, is worthy of Le Sage. It would be unjust to the writers to omit it, though it will suggest the thought that, as Alexander, if he had not been conqueror of the world, would have been Diogenes, so M. Huc if he had not been a Christian missionary, would have run some risk of being himself the Chevalier d'Industrie, whom he so racily describes. We give the passage in the original French, for the *gusto* with which the whole scene is drawn, the felicity of the expressions, the intelligent self-satisfaction of which the whole is redolent, defy translation,

‘ Nous nous arrêtàmes un instant, pour demander aux passants de vouloir bien nous indiquer une auberge des hôtes passagers ; aussitôt nous vîmes venir à nous avec empressement un jeune homme qui s’était élancé du fond d’une boutique.—Vous cherchez une auberge, nous dit-il, ô ! souffrez que je vous conduise moi-même ; et à l’instant il se mit à marcher avec nous.—Vous trouveriez difficilement l’auberge qui vous convient dans cette Ville-Bleue. Les hommes sont innombrables ici ; il y en a de bons, il y en a de mauvais ; n’est-ce pas, Seigneurs Lamas, que les choses sont comme je dis ? Les hommes ne sont pas tous de la même manière ; et qui ne sait que les méchants sont toujours plus nombreux que les bons ? Tenez, que je vous dise une parole qui sorte du fond du cœur ! Dans la Ville-Bleue on trouverait difficilement un homme qui se laisse conduire par la conscience ; et pourtant cette conscience c’est un trésor. . . Vous autres Tartares, vous savez ce que c’est que la conscience. Moi, je les connais depuis long-temps les Tartares ; ils sont bons, ils ont le cœur droit. Mais nous autres Chinois, ce n’est pas comme cela ; nous sommes méchants, nous sommes fourbes ; à peine sur dix mille Chinois pourrait-on en trouver un seul qui suive la conscience. Dans cette Ville-Bleue presque tout le monde fait métier de tromper les Tartares, et de s’emparer de leur argent.

‘ Pendant que ce jeune Chinois aux manières dégagées et élégantes nous débitait avec volubilité toutes ces belles paroles, il allait de l’un à l’autre, tantôt nous offrant du tabac à priser, tantôt nous frappant doucement sur l’épaule en signe de camaraderie ; quelquefois il prenait nos chevaux par la bride, et voulait lui-même les traîner. Mais toutes ces prévenances ne lui faisaient pas perdre de vue nos deux grosses caisses que portait un chameau. Les vives œillades qu’il y lançait de temps en temps, nous disaient assez qu’il se préoccupait beaucoup de ce qu’elles pouvaient contenir ; il se figurait qu’elles étaient remplies de précieuses marchandises, dont il ferait aisément le monopole. Il y avait déjà près d’une heure que nous allions dans tous les sens, et nous n’arrivions jamais à cette auberge qu’on nous promettait avec tant d’emphase.—Nous sommes fâchés, dîmes-nous à notre conducteur, de te voir prendre tant de peine, si encore nous savions clairement où tu nous mènes.—Laissez-moi faire, laissez-moi faire, Messeigneurs, je vous conduis dans une bonne, dans une excellente auberge ; ne dites pas que je me donne beaucoup de peine, ne prononcez pas de ces paroles. Tenez, ces paroles me font rougir ; comment, est-ce que nous ne sommes pas tous frères ? Que signifie cette différence de Tartares et de Chinois ? La langue n’est pas la même, les habits ne se ressemblent pas ; mais nous savons que les hommes n’ont qu’un seul cœur, une seule conscience, une règle invariable de justice. . . Tenez, attendez-moi un instant, dans un instant je suis auprès de vous, Messeigneurs . . . et il disparut comme un trait dans une boutique voisine. ’—Pp. 165—167.

He reappears with a thin, wizened accomplice, who presses on the ‘ noble Tartars ’ the ‘ Auberge de l’Équité Eternelle ; ’ the cautious Lamas, however, dodge on the road into the less pretending ‘ Hotel des trois Perfections.’

‘ Cela ne faisait pas le compte des deux Chinois ; cependant ils nous avaient suivis, et sans trop se déconcerter, ils continuèrent à jouer leur rôle.—Où sont les gens de l’auberge, criaient-ils avec affectation ; voyons qu’on ouvre une chambre grande, une chambre belle, une chambre propre. Leurs Excellences sont arrivées ; il leur faut un appartement convenable.—Un chef de l’hôtellerie se présente, tenant à ses dents une clef, d’une main un balai, et de l’autre un plat pour arroser. Nos deux protecteurs s’emparent à l’instant de tout cela. Laissez-nous faire, disent-ils ; c’est nous qui voulons servir nos illustres amis ; vous autres gens de l’auberge,

vous ne faites les choses qu'à moitié, vous ne travaillez que pour l'argent. . . Et les voilà aussitôt arrosant, balayant, frottant dans la chambre qu'ils viennent d'ouvrir.—P. 169.

Here another member of the same firm appears—an elegant young man—the son of the chief partner—charged with a bundle of sweetmeats and an invitation to dinner. But all in vain—they had unluckily caught—not a Tartar, but something infinitely more impracticable.

‘Pauvres Tartares, nous disions-nous, comme ils doivent être victorieusement exploités, quand ils ont le malheur de tomber en de pareilles mains ! Ces paroles, que nous prononçâmes en Français, excitèrent grandement la surprise de nos trois industriels.—Quel est l'illustre royaume de la Tartarie que vos Excellences habitent, nous demanda l'un d'eux ?—Notre pauvre famille n'est pas dans la Tartarie ; nous ne sommes pas Tartares.—Ah ! vous n'êtes pas Tartares. . . Nous le savions bien ; les Tartares n'ont pas un air si majestueux ; leur personne ne respire pas cette grandeur. Pourrait-on vous interroger sur votre noble patrie ?—Nous sommes de l'occident, notre pays est très-loin d'ici.—Ah ! c'est bien cela, fit le vieux, vous êtes de l'occident ; je le savais bien, moi. . . Ces jeunes gens comprennent très-peu de chose ; ils ne savent pas regarder les physionomies. . . Ah ! vous êtes de l'occident ? mais je connais beaucoup votre pays ; j'y ai fait plus d'un voyage.—Nous sommes charmés que tu connaisses notre pays. Sans doute tu dois comprendre notre langue.—Votre langue ? je ne puis pas dire que je la sais complètement, mais sur dix mots j'en comprends bien toujours trois ou quatre. Pour parler, cela souffre quelque difficulté ; mais peu importe, vous autres vous savez le Chinois et le Tartare, c'est bien. Oh ! les gens de votre pays sont des personnages de grande capacité. . . J'ai toujours été très-lié avec vos compatriotes ; je suis accoutumé à traiter leurs affaires. Quand ils viennent à la Ville-Bleue, c'est toujours moi qui suis chargé de faire leurs achats.

‘Les intentions de ces amis de nos compatriotes n'étaient pas douteuses ; leur grande envie de traiter nos affaires était pour nous une forte raison de nous débarrasser de leurs offres. Quand nous eûmes fini le thé, ils nous firent une grande révérence, et nous invitèrent à aller dîner chez eux.—Messeigneurs, le riz est préparé, le chef de notre maison de commerce vous attend.—Ecoutez, répondimes-nous gravement, disons quelques paroles pleines de raison. Vous vous êtes donné la peine de nous conduire dans une auberge, c'est bien, c'est votre bon cœur qui a fait cela ; ici vous nous avez rendu beaucoup de services, vous avez arrangé et disposé ceci et cela, votre maître nous a envoyé des pâtisseries ; évidemment vous êtes tous doués d'un cœur dont la bonté est inépuisable. S'il n'en était pas ainsi, pourquoi auriez-vous tant fait pour nous, qui sommes des étrangers ? Maintenant vous nous invitez à aller dîner chez vous ; . . . cela est bien de votre part, mais il est bien aussi de la nôtre de ne pas accepter. Aller ainsi dîner chez le monde, sans être lié par de longs rapports, cela n'est pas conforme aux rites de la nation Chinoise, cela est également opposé aux mœurs de l'occident. . . Ces paroles, prononcées avec gravité, désillusionnèrent complètement nos industriels. . . Si pour le moment nous n'allons pas dans votre boutique, ajoutâmes-nous, veuillez nous excuser auprès de votre maître ; remerciez-le des attentions qu'il a eues pour nous. Avant de partir, peut-être nous aurons quelques achats à faire, et alors ce sera pour nous une occasion d'aller vous rendre visite. Maintenant nous allons prendre notre repas au restaurant Turc qui est ici tout près.—C'est bien, dirent-ils d'un accent un peu dépité, c'est bien ; ce restaurant est excellent. . . A ces mots,

nous nous levâmes, et nous sortîmes tous ensemble; nous, pour aller dîner en ville, eux pour aller rendre compte au chef de leur boutique de la pitoyable issue de leur intrigue; nous, riant beaucoup de leur désappointement, eux fort contristés d'avoir si mal réussi dans leur manège.'—Pp. 170—172.

Travellers need hardly be told that the money changers who infest these towns, make a frightful profit of the poor Tartars. They baited their usual trap for M. Huc, but that gentleman swallowed the bait, and escaped scot free, leaving the Chinese, apparently, in the very unsatisfactory and unusual predicament of having cheated himself. But of all these various animals of prey, the most formidable is that which calls itself *par excellence* the Tartar-eater, 'Mangeur de Tartares.' One such our travellers met—a fat man on a lean horse, with a large straw hat on his head, and a long sabre at his side, travelling from one end to another of Tartary, to collect the debts which go on increasing from generation to generation—a supple, merciless, energetic dun, full of professional zeal, and a kind of diabolical glee in flaying his debtor. The creature relates with savage bursts of laughter and a self-satisfied burden of 'ah—ya! ah—ya!' how the childishness of the Tartars, captivated by any trifle, wholly ignorant of business and of the relative value of things, allows debt to accumulate upon debt, all bearing a compound interest of 30 or 40 per cent., till they become a mere sponge to be squeezed periodically by the Chinese usurer. 'Is not that fair?—a Tartar debt is never extinct: it passes from generation to generation. Every year we go out to levy the interest and get it in sheep, oxen, camels, and horses. That is worth twenty payments in money. We take their beasts cheap, and then we sell them dear.—Oh! la bonne chose qu'une dette Tartare. C'est une véritable mine d'or.'

It can hardly be doubted that for all this a day of reckoning is to come. The Chinese, with all their subtlety, industry, and determination, are cowards. The Tartars, with all their simplicity, indolence, and want of purpose, are at the bottom brave men, and nourish a restless memory of the time when they were a conquering people, and of the evils which they have suffered in other times from the treachery of the Chinese; and no song more deeply stirs the heart of a Mongol than the invocation of their great hero, Tamerlane. And they cherish hopes of a time when he or his successor will lead them to conquest. 'O divine Timour,' is the burden of their favourite song, 'when will thy great soul be born again among us? return, return, we wait for thee, O Timour.' 'A day will come,' says an old Tartar, 'known to our Grand Lamas, when the blood of our fathers, so unworthily murdered (by the Chinese), will be at length avenged. When the holy man, who is to lead us, shall

‘appear, one and all we shall arise and follow him. Then we shall march in the face of day to demand from the Kitat an account of the Tartar blood which they have shed in the darkness of their houses.’

Nor is this feeling mitigated by the fact, that the ruling dynasty is Tartar. The history of the Mantchou Tartars, who subdued China some two hundred years ago, presents, perhaps, not the least galling feature of Chinese encroachments.

‘Victorem victæ succubuisse queror.’

The Mantchous have been absorbed by and amalgamated in the superior subtlety and civilization of China—their dress, their habits, their very language, has disappeared. The externals of a Tartar dynasty merely exist to invest the Chinese with an illusory title to govern Tartary. To these externals and the name of their ‘holy master,’ many of the Tartars as yet feel a genuine loyalty. But this loyalty is a frail, because an unreal, principle. And it is impossible not to expect that as soon as any principle of union is found sufficiently strong and active to combine, and impel in one direction the tribes and families of Tartary, the hopes and recollections which are still smouldering in that country—their consciousness of physical and moral superiority, and not least, the pressure, always pregnant with revolutions, of overwhelming private debt, will result in a Mongol rebellion. And such a principle is to be found in their religion,—a structure equally remarkable in its theology, morals, and polity, deeply interesting as claiming to be the religion of three hundred millions of our fellow-creatures, and astonishing from the parallels which it exhibits to different elements and phases of the Christian religion.

To this we shall recur hereafter at length. But we cannot proceed to Thibet without explaining some leading points of Buddhism according to M. Huc’s statement of them, which, however, differs from that of Mr. Spence Hardy. Our readers are probably aware that the Budhists hold the doctrine of metempsychosis—they believe, that is to say, that every soul passes through a variety of lives, enjoying the reward, or suffering the punishment in each for the works which it has done in its previous lives, until, at last, it shall have accumulated sufficient merit to entitle it to the final reward of *nirvana*, annihilation, or absorption into the Deity. That Deity meanwhile is undergoing a multitude of incarnations on earth. The divine persons, who are produced by these incarnations, are called living Budhas, or Chabérons. They are to be found in considerable numbers; but the sovereign presence of the Deity is in the Talé-Lama, the Monarch of Thibet, who dwells at

Lassa, the Holy City of Buddhism. The whole system is administered by an immense body of Lamas—unmarried priests, who are partly scattered through the country, partly collected in establishments, bearing a considerable analogy to Christian monasteries. Most of these are presided over by a living Buddha, exercising by himself or his deputy a large amount of temporal as well as spiritual authority. Throughout Tartary these monasteries are subject in temporal things to the Emperor of China; in things spiritual, to the Talé-Lama. In Thibet, they are in both respects equally subject to the spiritual authority at Lassa. This short sketch will probably suffice to render intelligible, as well what we shall have to say respecting the political position of Thibet, as our missionaries' adventures in that city, to which they had been directed from every quarter as the source of spiritual light and authority, and the special residence of Buddhist divinity; in which they were most deeply interested, as the stronghold of that religion on which they had declared war, and for the conversion of which they had deliberately reserved and prepared themselves.

First, however, we shall view Thibet and its capital simply in its political and social aspect. The constitution of the country, if it can so be called, is, of course, despotic. In theory the Talé-Lama is its absolute sovereign, with a power only limited by certain traditional rules, inherited from Tsong-Kaba, the inspired reformer of Buddhism. In fact, however, he is a mere puppet, contenting himself at most with prescribing religious ceremonies, and receiving the adoration of his subjects. Nor could it well be otherwise. M. Huc suggests that the very greatness of his pretensions would prevent him from descending to the regulation of political business. But another less transcendental reason suggests itself. As the divine soul of the Talé-Lama is supposed by his death merely to migrate from one human body to another, it follows that till the Sovereign dies, his successor cannot be born. Every reign, therefore, begins by a long minority, during which, not only is the Sovereign's power in abeyance, but he himself is educated into nonentity. Of course such a state of things, if left to take care of itself, would soon become intolerable, and consequently the Government of Thibet must be so framed as to go on independently of its ostensible head. It is therefore practically administered by the Prime Minister or Nomekhan—himself also, not only a Lama, but a Chaberon, who holds his office for life, and is assisted by a council of four removable laymen, called Kalons. Subject to these ministers the general administration of affairs is in the hands of the priesthood. Each district is governed by a kind of Cardinal Legate, called a Lama Hou-

touktou. These petty princes, when the Talé-Lama dies, elect, or rather discover, his successor. They govern their respective provinces in a rude and independent kind of way, being apparently persons of a decidedly religious turn, but excessively warlike, not to say quarrelsome, habits.

The reader will be at once struck by certain elements of likeness between Lassa and Rome. So was M. Huc. 'Nous avons déjà parlé,' he says, 'des nombreuses et frappantes analogies qui existent entre les rites lamanesques et le culte Catholique. Rome et Lha-ssa—le Pape et le Talé-Lama pourraient encore nous fournir des rapprochemens pleins d'intérêt. Le gouvernement Thibétain étant purement lamanesque paraît en quelque sorte être calqué sur le gouvernement des états Pontificaux,' and as is usually the case, a variety of subordinate coincidences and contrasts spring out of or illustrate this general analogy of position. Lassa, like Rome, teems with temples, contrasting strongly with its dirty and impracticable streets. Like Rome it possesses the greatest, most venerated, and most sumptuous temple which Budhism boasts of, the object of devout curiosity to the Buddhist world. Like Rome, it swarms with pilgrims, is infested by beggars, and is enlivened or dignified by constant religious ceremonials, while, unlike Rome, it is a place of considerable commercial activity, and its inhabitants are prosperous and contented. The Thibetan, fierce, devotional and charitable to excess, might find his parallel in the Trasteverini; and the bells, which, if we remember right, mark the hour of the Ave Maria and the approach of sunset at Rome, may stand against a custom of Lassa, so beautiful that we cannot help extracting here M. Huc's account of it.

'There is a very touching custom at Lassa; which we were, in a manner, jealous of finding among the heathen. In the evening, when the day begins to decline, all the Thibetans leave off work, and meet together, men, women, and children, according to their sex and age, in the principal quarters of the town and in the public places. As soon as the groups are formed, every one crouches on the ground, and they begin to chant some prayers, slowly and half aloud. The religious music which arises from the midst of these numerous parties, produces in the whole town a great and solemn harmony, which makes a strong impression on the mind. The first time that we witnessed this scene, we could not refrain from making a sad comparison between this pagan town where every one prayed together, and those European cities where people would be ashamed to sign themselves openly with the cross.'—Vol. ii. p. 337.

But the irreligious and disaffected middle class, so formidable in the European metropolis, is here absent. The inhabitants of Lassa are fanatically attached to their sovereign, and obey him in matters when obedience is rather trying. Pious the IXth would scarcely venture to arrest the corruption of morals in the

pontifical city, by compelling all the women to daub their faces with a parti-coloured varnish. Yet this custom was imposed upon the Thibetan women, by an austere Nomekhan; and is still *in viridi observantiâ*, not, it is alleged, without some effect on the still loose manners of the country.

But the popular hierarchy and warlike people of Thibet are not less exposed to Chinese encroachment than their Tartar neighbours. It comes, however, in a different form. In Tartary an easy and simple barbarism is oppressed by a subtle and over-reaching civilization. In Thibet an energetic, but artless and ill-compacted nation is tricked, baffled and managed by the diplomacy of a powerful neighbour. The strength of the country is turned against itself, factions are encouraged to destroy each other, and the Chinese Ambassador (the resident at Lassa, as he would be called in Hindostan), rules by holding the balance. A great step had been taken shortly before our travellers' arrival at Lassa. For some time before that period, the transmigrations of the Talé-Lama had been alarmingly frequent. He never attained his majority, and a popular opinion gained ground that the Nomekhan of the day, an ambitious man, who did not wish his supremacy to be interfered with, was at the bottom of this phenomenon; in short, that the poor boys were successively made away with before they could become independent. The idea grew, till at last the Kalons themselves invoked the interference of the Chinese Emperor. The protection of a minor against an ambitious minister is a hacknied pretext for usurpation, and it was adopted with alacrity. It was determined to coerce and punish the traitorous Nomekhan. But this, at best, was no easy matter. For be the other circumstances what they might, the Nomekhan was also a Chaberon; and to coerce a divinity in the midst of a warlike and fanatical population, required all the adroitness and courage which the best man in China could put in play. The best man was accordingly selected for the operation. Our readers will be interested to learn that he was an old friend of theirs, no less a person than the Mandarin Keyen, or Ki-Chan, who alone had the capacity to estimate the power of England, and the courage to negotiate and conclude an ignominious peace. When the affair was finished, and it became clear that the Chinese had given in, Ki-Chan was disgraced for his pains. His property (of which he had amassed an enormous quantity) was confiscated, his house rased, his wives sold by auction, and himself banished to Tartary. But emergencies bring the ablest man to the top again, and the Thibetan crisis restored Ki-Chan, if not to favour, at least to employment. He justified the expectations of his friends. Without fighting, but not without driving bamboo splinters up

the nails of all the Nomekhan's household, he contrived to arrest, try and condemn that personage—to transport him, avowedly by authority of the Emperor, to Tartary—to constitute a regency in the person of the Chief Kalon—and, in the capacity of ambassador, to establish himself over all as the avowed protector of the Talé Lama, and the actual controller of the native government.

This was the state of things when the missionaries arrived at Lassa. They returned themselves duly to the police, and were for a short time unmolested. In fact, strangers are generally well received and little interfered with at Lassa, and the missionaries were at first no exception. One day, however, their surprise was excited by a series of visitors, who, in default of anything better to buy, insisted upon entering into negotiation for the purchase of their two old saddles. The purchase was evidently a pretext, and was left unfinished; but before our travellers had well decided what to think of it, they were summoned to present themselves before the Regent. They found him attended by four Lamas, 'au maintien modeste et composé;' two Chinese, 'dont le regard était plein de finesse;' and a grave, bearded and turbaned Mussulman. They were examined with an odd mixture of gravity, curiosity, good-humour, and simplicity. Were they Pelins? No, they were French. Could they write? Yes. Would they write something in their own language. They wrote in French, 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' Would they translate it? They rewrote it in Thibetan, Tartar, and Chinese. 'Yes,' said the Regent, 'it is true. You are men of wonderful learning. Here you can write in all languages, and you express thoughts as deep as those which we find in our books of prayers.' Then shaking his head slowly he repeated, 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' Their examination before the Chinese ambassador was more hostile and menacing. At last it appeared that all this was to issue in a strict visitation of their baggage. The truth was that both the Chinese and the Thibet authorities were horribly afraid of the English, the Yen-gee-dzee, or *Pelins de Galgata* (Calcutta) as M. Huc tells us we are called in Tartary and Thibet; and their nerves were excited into a perfectly morbid state by a mysterious event which had recently occurred. English accounts state on the best authority, that the well-known traveller, Moorcroft, died in 1825 on the road from Herat to Balk. But, according to the Thibetan account, collected and verified by M. Huc, he lived at Lassa for twelve years afterwards in the character of a Kachmerian. Nor even then would his country have been discovered if he had not been accidentally

assassinated by robbers. The government pursued the brigands and recovered part of his effects, from which they found, to their great discomposure, not only who he was, but also that he had been employing his time in making a variety of important maps and drawings. The consequence was a keen jealousy of any traveller who might possibly turn out to be a Pelin of Galgata, and an apprehension, amounting to horror, of anything which could be taken for a plan of their country. Our travellers were suspected of being map makers, and after some friendly intimations from the Regent that, if it were so, they had better own it, the charge was tested by a solemn examination of their property. All the notabilities assisted; the ambassador, the Regent, secretaries, lamas, and attendants—all equally curious, all equally astonished at the books, medals, prints and ecclesiastical ornaments, of which the missionaries exhibited an imposing, at least, if not a handsome, collection. What follows is so extremely characteristic of all parties—the clever and showy Chinese—the shrewd Frenchmen, and the well-intentioned Regent, that we shall extract it in full:—

‘The Regent and Ki-Chan, whose minds were of a more elevated cast, and who certainly did not covet our treasures, like the vulgar, had not less forgotten their office of judges. The sight of our beautiful coloured pictures was too much for them. The Regent clasped his hands, looking fixedly, with his mouth half open, while Ki-Chan harangued, played the man of knowledge, and explained to the audience how the French were the most famous artists in the world. Formerly, he said, he had known a French missionary at Pekin who made portraits which were so like, it was quite alarming. He kept his paper hidden in the sleeve of his robe, caught the features by stealth, and in the smoking of a pipe, all was done. Ki-Chan asked if we had not some watches, telescopes, magic lanterns, &c. We then opened a little box which no one had noticed, and which contained a microscope. We arranged its different parts, and none had eyes for anything but this strange machine of pure gold, and which, undoubtedly, was about to work wonders. Ki-Chan alone understood that it was a microscope. He explained it to the public with a good deal of pretension and vanity. Then he begged us to put some animalculæ on the object glass. We looked at his Excellency out of the corners of our eyes, then we took the microscope down bit by bit, and packed it into its box. “We thought,” said we to Ki-Chan, quite in a parliamentary tone, “that we had come here to undergo a sentence, not to play a comedy.” “What sentence have we to give?” he said, drawing himself up hastily. “We wished to examine your goods; to find out exactly what you are. That’s all.” “And the maps, have you forgotten them?” “Yes, yes, that is the point, where are your maps?” “Here they are;” and we unfolded the three maps which we possessed—a map of the world; one on Mercator’s projection, and one of the Chinese empire. The production of these maps fell like a thunder-bolt to the Regent. The poor man changed colour two or three times in a minute, as if we had unfolded our sentence of death. “We are happy,” we said to Ki-Chan, “to have met you in this country. If unfortunately you had not been here, we should have found it impossible to convince the authorities of Thibet that we had not drawn these maps ourselves. But for a well-

instructed man like you,—a man who knows European affairs, it is easy to see that these maps are not our workmanship." Ki-Chan seemed highly flattered by our compliment. "It is evident," he said, "at a glance, that these maps are printed. Here, look," he said to the Regent, "these men did not make the maps; they were printed in France. You don't understand how to discriminate between things of this kind; but I have been long used to articles that come from the West." These words worked like a charm upon the Regent; his countenance expanded; he looked at us with eyes sparkling with pleasure, and made us a gracious inclination of the head, as if to say, "It is well; you are honest fellows."

'It was impossible to proceed further without giving a geographical lesson. We charitably yielded to the desire of the Regent and the Chinese Ambassador. We pointed out on Mercator's map, China, Thibet, Tartary, and all the other countries on the globe. The Regent was overcome when he saw how far we were from our country, and what a long journey we had had to make, both by sea and land, to come and visit him in the capital of Thibet. He looked at us with bewilderment; then he held up the thumb of his right hand, saying, "You are men like that,"—which means in the figurative language of Thibet, "You are superlative men." After having recognised the principal points of Thibet, the Regent asked us where Calcutta was. "Here," said we, pointing out a small circle on the shores of the sea. "And Lassa! where is Lassa?" "Here." The Regent's eyes and finger passed from Lassa to Calcutta, and from Calcutta to Lassa. "The Pelins of Calcutta are very near our frontiers," said he, making a face and shaking his head. "Never mind," he then added, "Here are the Himalaya mountains!"—Vol. ii. pp. 317—319.

The visit ended in a complete triumph. It was settled, to the satisfaction of everybody, that the missionaries were Frenchmen, *i.e.* something different from English; and that not being map-makers, they might preach their religion as much as they pleased. They were at once established in apartments belonging to the Regent, when they lost no time in establishing and adorning a chapel, and soon, according to their own account, became rather the vogue at Lassa. Of course some persons attended their services from mere curiosity; some were interested; some appeared to be struck by the truths of Christianity, and earnestly anxious to study it. One of the secretaries of Ki-Chan even professed an intention to conform so soon as he should be disengaged from the embassy. One real and, unless the story is highly coloured, very remarkable case of conversion occurred.

'A physician, a native of Yun-Nan, showed a more generous spirit. From his first arrival at Lassa, this young man led so strange a life, that every one called him the *Chinese hermit*. He never went out but to see the sick, and usually he only visited the poor. The rich might send for him as much as they pleased, he did not condescend to attend, unless forced by necessity, for from the poor, to whose service he had devoted himself, he took nothing. The time that was not spent in visiting the sick, was devoted to study: he spent the greater part of the night over his books. He slept little, and took only one meal during the day of a little barley meal, never tasting meat. His very aspect showed that he led a very

severe life, his face was extremely pale and thin; and though he was at most but thirty years old, his hair was almost quite white.

'One day he came to see us while we were reciting the breviary in our little chapel: he stopped at a few paces from the door, and waited gravely and in silence. A large coloured picture of the crucifixion had no doubt fixed his attention; for directly we had finished our prayers, he asked us abruptly, and without the usual greetings, to explain to him what that picture meant. When we had complied with his request, he crossed his arms on his breast, and without saying a single word, he remained immovable, with his eyes fixed on the picture of the crucifixion; in this posture he remained nearly half an hour;—his eyes at last filled with tears, he stretched his arms towards Christ, then fell on his knees, touched the ground with his forehead three times, and got up again, crying out, "There is the only Budha that men ought to worship." Then he turned towards us, and bowing low, added, "You are my masters, take me for your disciple."

'The behaviour of this man moved us strangely; we could not but believe that Divine grace had powerfully touched his heart. We briefly laid before him the principal points of the Christian doctrine, and to all that we said, he merely answered with a surprising expression of faith; "I believe!" We gave him a small crucifix of copper gilt, and asked if he would accept it. He answered only by an eager inclination of the head;—as soon as he had the crucifix in his hands, he begged us to give him a string, and immediately hung it round his neck; he wished then to know what prayer he might say before the cross. "We will lend you," we said, "some Chinese books, where you will find some explanations of our doctrines and many forms of prayer." "It is well, my masters, but I wish to have a short easy prayer, which I may learn in a moment, and repeat often and everywhere." We taught him to say "Jesus, Saviour of the world, have mercy upon me." For fear of forgetting these words, he wrote them upon a piece of paper, which he put in a little purse hanging to his girdle; he left us, assuring us that the recollection of this day would never be effaced from his memory.

'This young physician engaged eagerly in learning the truths of Christianity. And it was remarkable that he did not seek to conceal the faith which he had in his heart. When he came to see us, or when we met him in the streets, his crucifix was always glittering on his breast, and he never failed to accost us, saying, "Jesus, Saviour of the world, have mercy upon us." It was the formula he used to greet us.'—Vol. ii. pp. 325—328.

But a work, in one sense more important, seemed to open itself in the conversion of the Regent himself, on whom they flattered themselves that they had made considerable impression. He appears to have been, what we should call in this country, a valuable public servant, clear-sighted, rapid, methodical, experienced, sufficiently, but not unduly, adroit, able to combine active employment with habits of study and management of men, and quick in apprehending and adopting the most effectual means of attaining his object. The Missionaries particularly admired the kindness and courtesy of his manners, the great beauty of his hand-writing, and the ease with which he knocked off business, through his secretaries, '*comme en se jouant*,' without interrupting his conversations with them. At the same time he was not a master-spirit. In the capital

of his own country, and with all the martial fanaticism of his countrymen to work upon, he was an instrument of the Chinese Emperor, and bent before the representative of that unprincipled and cowardly people.

The following is a specimen of the missionaries' religious intercourse with him.

"The Regent was very fond of religious discussions, which generally formed the principal subjects of our conversation. He began by these remarkable words,—“ You have undertaken all your long journeys only with a religious object: you are right, for religion is the important business of men; I see that on this subject the French and the Thibetans think alike. We are not at all like the Chinese, who think nothing of the concerns of the soul. However, your religion is not the same as ours; it concerns us to know which is the true one. We will then examine both attentively and honestly; if yours is true we will adopt it; how could we refuse to do so? If, on the contrary, it is ours, I think you will be reasonable enough to follow it.” This state of mind appeared to us excellent; we could not, for the time, desire anything better.

“ We began by Christianity. The Regent, always courteous in his intercourse with us, declared that, as we were his guests, our faith ought to take precedence. We brought under review, successively, the dogmatic and moral truths. To our great astonishment nothing seemed to surprise the Regent. “ Your religion,” he repeated, continually, “ is like ours; the truths are the same, we differ only in our explanations. You have, no doubt, found much to contradict in all that you have seen and heard in Tartary and Thibet; but you must not forget that the numerous errors and superstitions that you have observed, have been introduced by ignorant Lamas, and are rejected by learned Budhists.” He only allowed two points of difference between us, the origin of the world and the transmigration of souls. The belief of the Regent, though it seemed sometimes to approach Catholic doctrine, lost itself, nevertheless, in a vast Pantheism; but he contended that we arrived also at the same conclusions, and he tried hard to convince us of it.

“ The Thibetan language, essentially religious and mystic, expresses with great clearness and precision all the ideas which concern the human soul and Divinity. Unfortunately, we were not well skilled in this language, and were obliged, in our conversations with the Regent, to have recourse to the Kashmir Governor, as our interpreter; and as he was not very skilful in translating metaphysical ideas into Chinese, it was often very difficult for us to understand one another. One day the Regent said to us; “ Truth is clear in itself, but if it is wrapped up in dark words, one cannot understand it. As long as we are obliged to communicate through Chinese, it will be impossible to understand each other. Till you can speak Thibetan clearly we shall never talk to any purpose.” None could be more alive than we were to the justice of this observation. We answered the Regent that we were most anxious to master the language of Thibet, and, in fact, were working hard at it every day. “ If you like,” he said, “ I will make it more easy to you.” He called a servant and spoke a few words to him, which we did not understand. A very young man, elegantly dressed, immediately made his appearance, and saluted us gracefully. “ This is my nephew,” said the Regent, “ I give him to you as pupil and master; he shall pass the whole day with you, so that you can practise Thibetan, and in return you shall give him lessons in Chinese and Mantchou.” We gratefully accepted this proposal, and we were really enabled in this way to make rapid progress in the language of the country.”—Vol. ii. pp. 329—331.

In return, the missionaries instructed him, not only in the truths of Christianity, but in the grandeur of their country—unhesitatingly, and, we doubt not, in the most perfect good faith, crediting the *grande Nation*, with all the inventions and wonders of civilized Europe. ‘All that we told him of steam-boats, railroads, aéronauts, lighting by gas, telegraphs, daguerreo-types, and all our manufactures, filled him with amazement, and gave him the highest idea of the greatness and power of — France.’ At last he took to learning French. The account of his first lesson has about it something characteristic of the man’s intelligence.

‘One evening we brought him, as he desired, a French alphabet, with the sound of each letter written above it in Thibetan characters. He glanced at it, and when we wished to give him some explanation, answered that it was not necessary, for what we had written was very clear.

‘The next day, when we came before him, he asked what was the name of our Emperor. “Our Emperor is called Louis Philippe.” “Louis Philippe, Louis Philippe! very well.” He took his pencil and began to write: in an instant he gave us a bit of paper, on which was written, in very well formed letters, L-Ô-U-Y F-I-L-I-P-E.”—Vol. ii. p. 334.

The serious teachableness with which this Thibetan of evident capacity and apparent honesty attaches himself to the foreign missionary, contrasts favourably with the clever and confident self-importance of the Chinese ambassador. Ki-Chan, however, was the bolder and abler man, of greater penetration and wider experience, and his conferences with our French friends are certainly not less amusing.

‘He summoned us twice or thrice,’ says M. Huc, ‘to talk politics, or, to use the Chinese expression, to say idle words. We were much surprised to find him so well-informed on the affairs of Europe. He spoke much to us of the English and of Queen Victoria. “It appears,” he said, “that that woman has a good understanding; but her husband, in my opinion, plays a very ridiculous part; she does not let him meddle with anything. She has got a garden laid out for him full of fruit-trees, and all kinds of flowers, and there he is always shut up, passing all his time walking about. They say, that in Europe there are other kingdoms where the women govern. Is that true? are their husbands also shut up in gardens? Have you this custom in the kingdom of France?” “No, in France the women are in the gardens, and the men occupy themselves in business.” “That is reasonable, to act otherwise is disorderly.”’—Vol. ii. pp. 334, 335.

Whatever our gracious Queen might think, Prince Albert might fairly demur to this evidence of Ki-Chan’s accurate knowledge of the affairs of Europe, unless, indeed, the fruit-garden may be taken as a Chinese anticipation of the Great Crystal Palace. But to proceed.

‘Ki-Chan asked us about Palmerston, and whether he had still charge of Foreign Affairs; “and Ilu, (Elliott,) what is become of him—do you know?” “He has been recalled; your fall caused his.” “It is a pity. Ilu had a

good heart ; but he did not know how to take a resolution. Has he been put to death or exiled ?" " Neither the one nor the other. They do not go so roundly to work in Europe as in Pekin." " Yes, that is true ; your mandarins are happier than we are. Your Government is better than ours ; our Emperor cannot know everything, and yet he judges everything ; and no one can say anything against his acts. Our Emperor says to us, ' See, this is white.' We prostrate ourselves, and answer, ' Yes, that is white.' He then shows us the same object, and says, ' See, this is black.' We prostrate ourselves again, and answer, ' Yes, that is black.' " " But if you said that a thing cannot be both white and black ?" " The emperor would perhaps say to him who was so bold, ' You are right ;' but, at the same time, he would cause him to be immediately strangled or beheaded. Oh ! we have not, as you have, an assembly of all the chiefs, (Tchoung-Teou-Y, so Ki-Chan called our *Chambre des Députés*.) If your Emperor wished to act contrary to justice, your Tchoung-Teou-Y would prevent his desire." —Vol. ii. pp. 335, 336.

Ki-Chan was a member of the Chinese cabinet when war with the English was decided upon,—a step which European nations consider not unworthy of a serious discussion. Our readers will not be sorry to learn, on the best authority, how it was knocked off in China. Here is the Cabinet Minister's account of it:—

' The Emperor assembled the Eight Tchoung Tang which composed his secret council, and spoke to them of the events which had taken place in the south. He told them that the adventurers of the southern seas had become rebellious and insubordinate ; that they must be taken, and severely punished, in order to be an example to those who might be tempted to imitate their conduct. Having thus shown his opinion, the Emperor asked the advice of his council. The four Mantchou Tchoung Tang prostrated themselves, saying—"Tché, tché, tché, Tchou-Dze-Ti, Fan-Fou." " Yes, yes, yes ; that is the master's order." The four Chinese Tchoung-Tang prostrated themselves in their turn, and said, " Ché, ché, ché Hoang-Chang-Ti, Tien-Ngen." " Yes, yes, yes ; it is the celestial benefit of the Emperor." After that, there was no more to be said, and the council was dismissed.'—Vol. ii. p. 336.

Under such countenance the missionaries prospered. They had been but a month at Lassa, ' et déjà les nombreux habitants de cette ville étaient accoutumés à parler avec respect de ' la sainte doctrine de Jehovah et du grand royaume de France.' But a reverse was at hand. Suddenly their friend Ki-Chan demanded their expulsion. The Regent took their part. A characteristic argument ensued. ' If their doctrine were false,' said the Regent, following in the footsteps of Gamaliel, ' it ' would not prevail : if it were true, all the world were bound to ' adopt it.' Whether it were false or true, replied Ki-Chan, it threatened the divine authority of the Talé-Lama, whose interest he was there to protect. After some discussion, the weaker went to the wall, and the missionaries commenced their preparations for departure. This sudden disappointment is ascribed to various causes ; by M. Huc to the machinations of the devil,

and Ki-Chan's dread of French influence arising in their persons; by Ki-Chan himself, alternately to his zeal for the Talé-Lama, and his intimate persuasion that any toleration of Christianity would cost him his head. It appears to us sufficiently accounted for by a little circumstance which M. Huc drops as if nothing turned upon it. They had asked the Regent's assistance in opening a communication with Calcutta. We can hardly conceive a more flagrant act of indiscretion, or one more certain to produce the results which actually followed, viz. their summary deportation through the heart of Thibet and China to Macao. However that may be, their exit being clearly determined upon, every possible indulgence was shown them in details. The Regent furnished them with letters of recommendation to all the Houtouktous on the road. Ki-Chan gave them a Chinese escort, consisting of the mandarin, Ly-Kouo-Ngan, (the Pacifier of Kingdoms,) an old worn-out debauchee, and a party of fifteen soldiers. Nay, he even requested them to charge themselves with some large boxes of valuables, which it seems he could not safely trust to any one but the Christians whom he was oppressing. But the one point was clear,—they were to go, and they did go. Their adieus to those who had learnt wholly or in part the truths of Christianity were kind and affectionate; that with the Regent significant; but the parting scene with Ki-Chan deserves to be extracted at length:

'We entered with our conductor into Ki-Chan's apartment. The fifteen soldiers stopped at the threshold of the door, and drew up in file; after having prostrated themselves, and touched the ground thrice with their foreheads, the Pacifier of Kingdoms did the same; but the poor wretch could only rise again with our help. We saluted, as was our custom, by putting our caps under our arms. Ki-Chan began to speak, and made a little harangue to each of us.

'Addressing himself first to us, he spoke in a wheedling and affected tone. "Here," he said, "you are going to return to your country; I think you will not complain of me; my conduct towards you is irreproachable. I do not allow you to remain here, but that is the will of the great Emperor, not mine; I do not allow you to go to India, because the laws of the empire forbid it; if not, old as I am, I would myself accompany you to the frontier. The route that you are about to take is not so frightful as people pretend; it is true you will have a little snow; you will find some high mountains; there will be some cold days. You see I do not hide the truth from you. Why should I deceive you? But at any rate you will have men to attend upon you; you will find a lodging ready every evening; you will not be obliged to pitch your tent. Is not this road much better than the one you travelled here by? You will be obliged to ride. I cannot give you a palanquin; there are none to be found in this country. I shall send my report to the great Emperor in a few days; as my couriers travel day and night, it will precede you. When you shall arrive in peace at the capital of Tse-Tchouen, the viceroy Pao will take charge of you, and my responsibility will be over. You may depart with confidence, expanding your hearts. I have already sent orders that you should be well treated wherever you go. May a happy star guide your journey from first to last!"

"Although we feel we are oppressed," we answered, "nevertheless we wish for your prosperity. Since you aspire to honours, may you regain all you have lost, and attain yet greater!" "Oh! my star is evil, my star is evil!" cried Ki-Chan, taking a large pinch of snuff from his silver box.

"Then addressing himself to the Pacifier of Kingdoms, his voice became suddenly grave and solemn. "Ly-Kouo-Ngan," he said, "since the great Emperor allows you to return to his family, you are to depart. You will have these two travelling companions, and that ought to rejoice you much; for you know the road is long and tedious. These men are full of justice and mercy; you will, therefore, live in great harmony with them. Be careful never to sadden their hearts either by word or deed. I have another important thing to tell you; as you have served the empire for twelve years on the frontiers of Ghorkha, I have ordered the treasurer to send you five hundred ounces of silver. It is a present from the great Emperor." At these words, Ly-Kouo-Ngan, finding at once an unwonted flexibility in his legs, flung himself impetuously on his knees. "The celestial benefits of the great Emperor," he said, "have always and everywhere surrounded me; but, bad servant as I am, how can I, without blushing, receive such a signal favour? I earnestly supplicate the ambassador that he will allow me to hide my face, and withdraw myself from this undeserved favour." Ki-Chan answered, "Do you think that the great Emperor will thank you for your disinterestedness? What are a few ounces of silver? There, take this little sum, since it is offered to you; you will have enough to drink a cup of tea with your friends; but when you are down there, beware of beginning again with brandy. If you desire to live a few years longer, keep yourself from brandy. I say this to you because a father and mother should give their children good advice." Ly-Kouo-Ngan struck the earth thrice with his forehead, then rose and stood beside us.

"Lastly, Ki-Chan harangued the soldiers, and changed his tone for the third time. His voice was sharp, abrupt, sometimes almost angry and passionate. "And you, soldiers, there." At these words, the fifteen soldiers, as if moved by a single spring, fell at once on their knees, and remained in this attitude throughout the address. "Let us see; how many are you? fifteen, I think," and at the same time he counted them with his finger. "Yes, that is it, fifteen men. You fifteen soldiers, you are about to return to your province, your service is over; you are to escort your Tou-Sse and these two strangers to Sse-Tchouen; you must serve them faithfully on the road, and be careful to be always obedient and respectful. Do you clearly understand these words?" "Yes, we understand." "When you go through the villages of the Poba (Thibetans) woe to you if you oppress the people; beware of pillaging and taking other people's goods. Do you clearly understand?" "Yes, we understand." "Do not hurt the flocks, respect the fields in seed. Do not burn the forests. Do you clearly understand?" "Yes, we understand." "Let there always be peace and harmony between you. Are you not all soldiers of the empire? Do not, then, slander and abuse one another. Do you clearly understand?" "Yes, we understand." "Whoever behaves ill, need not think to escape punishment; his crime will be carefully examined and severely punished. Do you clearly understand?" "Yes, we understand." "Since you understand, obey and tremble!" After this short, but energetic peroration, the fifteen soldiers struck the ground thrice with their foreheads and rose up."—Vol. ii. pp. 386—389.

For some time their journey was easy enough. They travelled through the semi-civilized low country, where the influence of the Chinese Emperor was substantial, and where,

accordingly, the Pacificator of Kingdoms exacted *oulahs*,—that is to say, pressed men and horses, and billeted his people on the inhabitants at pleasure. But when they plunged into the mountains, their difficulties began. In the first place, the roads were frightful. We do not, indeed, collect that there was any danger or hardship to be encountered which many a traveller of ordinary enterprise has not faced for amusement; but our missionaries appear to have imagined themselves continually hanging between life and death. The rickety wooden bridges by which they had to scramble along precipitous cliffs, or the steep mountain sides, which hardly afforded a footing for their horses, must certainly have been trying to the nerves; but they saw destruction in them at every step—not because they were either cowards or boasters, for they are neither; but because their French imaginations on these, as on some other occasions, were a little too much for them. But another difficulty lay in the people. The hardy and warlike mountaineers felt neither love nor fear to the Emperor of China or his men, and very usually regarded them with aversion and contempt. It need hardly be said, that in such a country the demand for *oulahs* was little attended to; and, in spite of threats, complaints, and cajoleries, the Pacificator had to pay down *argent comptant*, a very full and sufficient price for every man, horse, or dish of oatmeal, that he or his escort required. On these occasions, the Lamas of the West were rather more able to aid the Mandarin than he to protect them. Their first difficulty of this kind arose in the province of Kham—part of a country which was a subject of contention between two rival Houtouktous; the one possessing the advantages of age, legitimacy, and Chinese patronage; the other, those of youth, popular favour, and, probably, impudence—for he founded his title on a grant made to him, as he declared, in one of his anterior lives, by the then Talé Lama. The following picture of the mountain chief, Proul-Tamba, tells its own story. It is only necessary to premise that he was a leading partizan of the younger and more popular claimant, a redoubtable warrior, and an eminent theologian; and, finally, that his father was the disciple of a celebrated anchorite, or contemplative Lama, who had spent twenty-two years in a mountain cave, ‘passing day and night in prayer and meditation on the ten thousand virtues of Budha.’ To this potentate the Pacificator had appealed against the exactions of his people, and he came in person to settle the dispute. He arrived with a train of four horsemen, received with something less than courtesy the cringing civilities of the Chinese, and took summarily the place of honour on a carpet of grey felt. The rest seated themselves in a respectful circle around.

‘There was a moment of profound silence. The great chief, Proul-Tamba, was, at most, but forty years old; he was of middle height, and his only dress was a large robe of green silk, lined with fine wolf-skin, and girt at the loins with a red band. Large violet-coloured leather boots, a frightful cap of fox’s-skin, and a long and wide sabre, fastened horizontally to his girdle, completed his costume. Long, jet-black hair, which hung down upon his shoulders, gave a very energetic expression to his pale, thin countenance. The eyes were the most remarkable feature in the countenance of this man; they were large, flashing, and full of indomitable courage and pride. In all his bearing, Proul-Tamba appeared to be a very superior man, and born to command among his race. After having looked attentively at all of us, one after another, resting his hands on the two ends of his sabre, he drew out of his breast a packet of little¹ khata, and made one of his men give us each one. Then turning towards Ly-Kouo-Ngan, “Ah! here you are, back again,” he said, in a voice which sounded like a bell; “if I had not heard this morning that it was you, I should not have known you again. How old you have grown, since you last passed through Bagoung!” “Yes, you are right,” answered the Pacifier of Kingdoms, in a sugary voice; and dragging himself on the felt carpet, to get nearer his companion,—“Yes, you are right; I am very infirm; but as for you, you are more vigorous than ever.” “We live in times when it is necessary to be vigorous. . . . There is no longer peace in our mountains.” “True; I heard below you have had a little contest among yourselves.” “It is more than a year since the tribes of Kham have waged fierce war with each other; and do you call that a little contest? You need only keep open your eyes on your road, and you will see everywhere ruined villages and burnt forests. In a few days we shall have to set to work again, for no one will hear words of peace. This war might have ended with a few battles; but since you Chinese have meddled with our affairs, parties have become irreconcilable. Oh! you Chinese mandarins only serve to bring disorder and confusion into our country. This cannot last. We have let you have your own way for a long time, and now your audacity is boundless. I cannot, without shuddering all over, think of that affair of the Nomekhan of Lassa. They pretend that the Nomekhan committed great crimes. It is false. These great crimes are inventions of yours. The Nomekhan is a saint—a living Budha. Who ever heard tell that a living Budha could be judged and exiled by Ki-Chan, a Chinese, a black man?” “The order came from the great Emperor,” answered Ly-Kouo-Ngan, in a low and trembling voice. “Your great Emperor!” cried Proul-Tamba, turning passionately towards the speaker; “your great Emperor is nothing but a black man. What is your Emperor in comparison of a Grand Lama—of a living Budha?”

‘The great chief of the province of Kham inveighed for a long time against the dominion of the Chinese in Thibet. He alternately attacked the emperor, the viceroy of Sse-Tchouen, and the ambassadors of Lassa. In the midst of his energetic philippics, he continually reverted to the matter of the Nomekhan. We saw that he was greatly interested in the fate of the Grand Lama, whom he looked upon as a victim of the court of Pekin. The Pacifier of Kingdoms was careful not to oppose him; he pretended to share Proul-Tamba’s feelings, and hastened to receive all his words with slight inclinations of his head. At last he ventured to drop some words about his departure, and the oulah. “The oulah!” answered Proul-Tamba, “henceforward there shall be none for the Chinese, unless they consent to pay properly for them. It is enough that we allow the Chinese to enter

¹ All polite intercourse in Thibet begins by one party presenting the other with a khata, a scarf or handkerchief, of a value proportioned to the occasion.

our country, without being also fools enough to give them the oulah gratis. However, as I have known you for a long time, there shall be an exception made in favour of your caravan. Besides, you have charge of two Lamas from the western heaven, who have been recommended to me by the first Kalon of Lassa, and who have a right to my service. Where is the Dheba of Bagoung? let him come forward." The man, who the day before had come to say to us, "No money, no oulah," presented himself; he knelt on one knee before the great chief, and respectfully stuck out his tongue¹ at him. "Let them bring the oulah instantly," cried Proul-Tamba, "and let every one do his duty!" The Thibetans who were in the court of the guard-house shouted all at once, and ran off to the neighbouring village. Proul-Tamba rose; and after having invited us to take tea at his house, which was in our road, he sprang on his horse, and returned at full gallop. The oulah soon arrived, and the caravan was organized as if by magic.—Vol. ii. pp. 467—471.

At the next village of Gaya they were still less fortunate. After an animated discussion carried on by the whole mob of the place, man, woman, and child, all shouting and gesticulating at the same time, the proceedings concluded with a general peal of laughter, and the decision of the conclave was formally communicated to the Pacificator,—*videlicet*—That the Lamas of the West and the Thibetans would have their beasts for nothing, but that the Chinese must pay to the tune of half an ounce of silver for every horse, and a quarter for every bullock.

'At this news, Ly-Kouo-Ngan collected all his strength, and began to inveigh energetically against what he called tyranny and injustice. The Chinese soldiers of the caravan who were present, betook themselves to loud cries and menaces, in order to intimidate the delegates from the national assembly of Gaya; but these maintained an attitude admirably proud and disdainful; one of them made one step forward, placed, with a kind of savage dignity, his right hand upon Ly-Kouo-Ngan's shoulder, and fastening on him for a moment his large black eyes, shaded by thick lashes, "Man of China," he said, "listen to me; dost thou think that for a dweller in the valley of Gaya there is any great difference between cutting off the head of a Chinese or of a kid? Tell your soldiers, then, not to be fierce and speak such great words. Has any one ever seen a fox scare the terrible mountain Yak? The oulah will come in a moment; if you do not take them; if you do not start to-day,—to-morrow the price will be double." The Chinese perceiving that violence would only lead to untoward results, had recourse to tricks and flattery; but all was useless. Ly Kouo-Ngan had nothing for it but to open his strong box and weigh out the required sum.'—Vol. ii. pp. 478, 499.

These little difficulties, however, did not impede their progress. A more important event was the death of their friend the Pacificator, caused partly by a life of indulgence in spirituous liquors and other forms of excess, partly by the fatigues of the journey, partly by his own stinginess in not providing himself with proper appliances. As his end approached he had many serious conversations with the missionaries, who flattered themselves that he was on the point of embracing Christianity. It

¹ This is the mode of doing obeisance in Thibet.

was impossible to speak more feelingly than he did of the uncertainty of human life, the importance of salvation, the truth of Christianity, and the obligation of embracing it. 'Il nous dit surtout cela des choses très sensées et très touchantes.' But he was prevented from pushing his admissions to any practical conclusion, partly, it would seem, by an obstinate veneration for the Great Bear, partly by a vague but unconquerable apprehension that there was some physical impossibility in embracing Christianity while an *employé* of the emperor. He proposed to become a Christian in the bosom of his family. Like a French constitution, after having been some time at the point of death, he died at a moment when nobody happened to be expecting it, and left the missionaries to take command of the party till they could deliver themselves over to the next Mandarin, by whom they were forwarded without any further events to the frontier of China, where the story leaves them. Further, we only gather that M. Huc crossed to Macao, and proceeded to France, where he was disappointed to find that the new revolutionary government declined to involve itself on his account in a war with the celestial emperor. He appears since to have returned to China in order to resume his labours in Mongol Tartary.

We now proceed to the second part of our subject, the Buddhist religion. And at this point we begin to avail ourselves of the book of Mr. Spence Hardy, a Wesleyan missionary in Ceylon. This gentleman has apparently a far greater knowledge of books, but far less of persons and countries than M. Huc. The arrangement of his book is bad, being too much influenced by the object with which he writes it; but it is very curious, very laborious, and is crowded with extracts from original sources which can hardly fail to be valuable. 'A residence,' he says, 'of twenty years in Ceylon, and several thousands of hours spent with the palm leaf in my hand, and the ex-priest of Budha at my side to assist me in cases of difficulty, entitle me to claim attention to my translations as a faithful transcript of the original documents.'

The Buddhist religion would be a matter of grave interest to the Christian from the mere fact already mentioned, that it professes to be the religion of 360 millions of our fellow-creatures. But it is also a very wonderful structure in itself, almost equally so in its truth and in its falsehood, in its doctrines and its practical development. But the attention of a Christian is at once and more peculiarly arrested by the strange reflections of Christianity on which he falls—now in the theological outlines of Budhism; now in the spirit, or even letter, of its moral precepts; now in its legends or hagiology; now in its ecclesiastical organization; now in the minute details of its

ceremonial. Much it has in common with the Christianity of the Bible, much with that of the early ages; but when we compare it with the Christianity of modern or mediæval Rome, we are involved in a multitude of detailed and diversified analogies, not less in spirit and tone of thought than in dress and externals, which is perfectly startling. This similarity is not a matter of controversy; it is one of those obvious facts which strike a casual observer, and grow upon examination. A chance visitor of a Buddhist lamaserie (if our readers happen to have met with such) at once observes its analogy to a Roman convent. Schlegel, as a philosophic historian, stigmatizes the Buddhist hierarchy as a diabolical caricature of the Catholic Church. M. Huc, as an inquiring traveller, records with a gratified wonder, and attempts to account for, the flood of coincidences among which he finds himself. Lamas themselves declare, on receiving his explanations of Christianity, that the two religions are almost identical. And Mr. Spence Hardy exhibits in most elaborate detail, and from an opposite aspect, the analogy between Eastern and Western Monachism. In the following sketch of Buddhism we shall endeavour first to illustrate this parallel—perhaps to a Christian its most astonishing feature, and more incidentally to touch on its political bearing on the state of the Chinese empire.

We begin with theology; by which we mean those great truths respecting the nature of the Godhead, the relations in which He has placed Himself to His creatures, and the destiny which He has assigned to them, which lie at the bottom of all religion. We have already slightly touched on this point. We have seen that, while the Chief Kalon at Lassa professed that his religion contained the great truths of Christianity, (at least, those which his teacher thought it expedient to disclose to him,) M. Huc, on the contrary, was convinced that the Buddhist theology issued in nothing more than a vast pantheism. The same impression is brought out more clearly in the following account of a conversation which took place at an earlier period of his travels:—

‘In the Blue City, as at Tolon Noor, every one repeated to us that the doctrine would appear more sublime and luminous as we travelled towards the west. According to Lamas who had visited Thibet, Lassa was a great centre of light, of which the rays became continually weaker as they receded from their source.

‘One day we had an opportunity of conversing for some time with a Thibetan Lama; what he told us on points of religion threw us into the greatest astonishment. A short explanation of the Christian doctrine which we gave him, seemed to surprise him little; he even contended that our words did not greatly differ from the belief of the Grand Lamas of Thibet. “You must not confound,” he said, “religious truth with the numerous superstitions which excite the credulity of the ignorant. The

Tartars are simple; they prostrate themselves before whatever they meet; all is *Borhan* to their eyes. The Lamas, the books of prayer, the temples, the houses in the lamaserie, even the stones, and the bones that they heap up upon the mountains, they put all in the same rank; at every step they prostrate themselves on the ground, put their clasped hands on their foreheads and cry, *Borhan, Borhan.*" "But do not the Lamas also allow innumerable Borhans?" "That requires explanation," he said, smiling; "*there is but one single sovereign who has created all things; he has neither beginning nor end.* In Dchagar (India) he is called Budha, and in Thibet, Samtchè-Mitchèba (Eternal Almighty); the Chinese call him Fo, and the Tartars, Borhan." "You say that Budha is one; what, then, are the Talè-Lama of Lassa, the Bandchan of Djachi-Loumbo, the Tsong-Kaba of the Sifan, the Kaldan of Tolon Noor, the Guison-Tamba of Grand Kouren, the Hobilgan of the Blue Town, the Hotoktou of Pekin, and all those numerous Chaberons living in the lamaserie of Tartary and Thibet?" "All are equally Budha." "Is Budha visible?" "No, he is without a body; he is a spiritual being." "Therefore Budha is one; and yet there are innumerable Budhas, such as the Chaberons and others. Budha is incorporeal, we cannot see him, and yet the Talè-Lama, the Guison-Tamba, and the rest, are visible and have a body like ours. How can you explain that?" "This doctrine," he said, extending his arms, and assuming a remarkable tone of authority,—"*this doctrine is true; it is the doctrine of the West; but it is of unfathomable depth; it cannot be fully explained.*"

The words of the Thibetan Lama were a strange surprise to us. The unity of God, the mystery of the Incarnation, the dogma of the Real Presence, appeared to us as it were concealed in his belief; *yet with ideas so just in appearance, he admitted the metempsychosis, and a sort of pantheism of which he could give no real account.*

These new views of the religion of Budha made us augur that we should really find, among the Lamas of Thibet, a creed more pure and high than that of the vulgar. We persisted in our resolution of pushing on towards the west.—Vol. i. pp. 194—196.

'There is,' says the priest, 'but one single sovereign, who has created all things. He has neither beginning nor end.' And it is evident that to this sovereign not only the devout and uninstructed vulgar, but the learned Lamas, address themselves in order to obtain from him that which they want. 'Budha is the master of life and death,' says a priest to M. Huc; 'it is proper that we should pray to him to deliver us from disease.' 'Budha has given us the knowledge of medicines,' and everything else that is good. The main test which M. Huc applies to the religion of the Tartars, and on the strength of which he acknowledges their claim to be a religious people, is that they are 'men of prayer.' But, if we are to understand 'pantheism' in its natural sense—the denial of the Divine Personality, and the substitution of a mechanical agency for a Supreme Will—it is difficult to reconcile it with the more living creed which is involved in this practical religion of the Tartars. The natural explanation would seem to be, that both the vulgar and the learned do believe themselves practically to be under the government of such a supreme will, of which the

special residence is not on earth, but which embodies itself in the persons of their living Budhas or Chabérons; yet that, notwithstanding this belief, thoughtful persons are entangled in certain philosophical conceptions from which pantheism is the logical consequence. But the documentary theology of Buddhism, according to Mr. Spence Hardy's account of it, is more unequivocally bad. It is too little to call it pantheism; it occasionally approaches atheism, and is in fact so called by Mr. Spence Hardy.

In Buddhist theology, according to him (p. 5), there is no Creator, no Being that is self-existent and eternal. The Source of all things is not either spirit or matter, but *karma*, or action, of which all sentient beings are homogeneous developments. The only material difference between them is that of the merit or demerit which is accumulated by each soul (or, rather, by the 'karma' which that soul represents) during the countless phases of existence through which it passes. Demerit is punished by a penal transmigration, merit rewarded by a happy one. The vicious being finds himself born after death into the state of a toad or polypus, perhaps even in hell, a place of frightful and indefinite, though not endless suffering. He, on the contrary, who has satisfied the precepts of religion, is rewarded by a birth among the *devas*, or *Brahma-lokas*, who dwell above the Mahameru, a mountain in the centre of the earth. Higher even than these angelic beings is the state of a *rahat*, a man in whom the eradication of all evil desire is rewarded by supernatural knowledge, and power of the wildest and most eccentric kind. But the highest state of existence is that of the Budhas—divine beings, who appear at immense intervals of time, with miraculous if not infinite powers, and charged with the office of teaching man the way of salvation. This state is the reward of those alone who, through myriads of ages and countless lives, have steadily kept it before them as the object of their successive existences.

But beyond all these states of existence is something higher still—*nirvāṇa*, or non-existence. What this is, it is difficult to make out. Sometimes it appears to be a kind of absorption into a kind of divinity, sometimes it appears to be a mere cessation of being. Mr. Spence Hardy gives some curious arguments on the subject between orthodox teachers and objecting learners. They are very subtle and precise, full of illustration, and, at first sight, promising a very definite conclusion; but the end is, that the orthodox believer slips through your fingers. On the one hand, *nirvāṇa* appears to be, and to be a sensation. 'Great king,' says the sage Nagasena to the King of Sagal, '*nirvāṇa* is. It is a perception of the mind. The pure, de-

'lightful, *nirwāna*, free from ignorance and evil desire, is perceived by the *rahats* who enjoy the fruition of the paths?' Again, it is 'free from danger, safe, without fear, *happy*, peaceful, *the source of enjoyment*, refreshing.' On the other hand, it is neither created nor uncreated, it is neither past, present, nor future; it is nowhere, except in them who attain it, and though brought into existence by attainment, is without cause. It cannot be described 'by sign, locality, length, manner, metaphor, cause, or order.' It can only be understood by the sight of those who have attained it. Such persons appear to be visible, yet *nirwāna* is the cessation of 'successive'—much more of visible existence, and even (in Mr. Spence Hardy's view) of existence itself. 'It is filled with the perfume of emancipation from existence, as the surface of the sea is covered by flower-resembling waves.'

'The man who sees a bar of iron that has been heated to the highest possible degree can discover no way whatever in which it will be desirable to hold it; and it is the same with him who contemplates the evils of successive existence; he can see no form whatever in which it is to be desired. Like a fish caught in a net; like a frog when attracted to the mouth of a serpent; like a bird in the claws of a cat; like a nayá in the beak of a garunda; like the moon in the mouth of Ráhu; he struggles to obtain release from existence.'—*Eastern Monachism*, p. 299.

A melancholy moral indeed—beautifully versified by our own Spenser—not, however, as the voice of religion, but among the subtle promptings of the miscreant '*Despair*.'

'What if some little payne the passage have
That makes frayle flesh to feare the bitter wave;
Is not short payne well borne, that brings long ease,
And lays the soule to sleepe in quiet grave?
Sleepe after toyle, port after stormie seas,
Ease after warre, death after life doth greatly please.

* * * * *

Then doe no further goe, no further stray;
But here ly downe and to thy rest betake,
Th' ill to prevent, that life ensewen may.
For what hath life, that may it loved make,
And gives not rather cause it to forsake?
Feare, sicknesse, age, losse, labour, sorrow, strife,
Payne, hunger, cold that makes the heart to quake;
And ever fickle fortune rageth rife;
All which and thousands mo, do make a loathsome life.'

Nor is it less puzzling, even to the docile King of Sagal, than it is melancholy. 'Venerable sir,' he says, 'you told me that Budha has declared that the fourth path is the cause of the accomplishment of *nirwāna*, and yet you say also that *nirwāna* is without a cause. I am confounded: I go from darkness into deeper darkness. I am in a forest: I go from an entangled

'thicket into a thicket more entangled. If there is a cause for the attributes or accompaniments of nirwána, there must also be a cause for the production of nirwána. The son must have a father: that father must have had another father.' And so he proceeds in a state of much perplexity. The unbelievers too, or *tirttakas*, pushed him to unpleasant conclusions respecting the bearing of this doctrine on the nature of God; suggesting a series of questions and difficulties which curiously illustrate what is sometimes called the 'theosophy' of Buddhism, and exhibit in an oriental form the mystery equally beyond the grasp of Eastern or Western, of the child or of the philosopher—the mystery which requires us to believe that the unchangeableness of the Deity is not irreconcilable with the efficacy of prayer.

"The *tirttaka* unbelievers," says King Milinda, "argue in this manner:—If Budha now receives the offerings of men, he has not attained nirwána, as in that state all cleaving to existing objects is destroyed; he is still connected with the world; he is yet existent; he is in the world, and has the same attributes as other beings; therefore the assistance that he can render is imperfect, vain, and worthless. But if he has attained nirwána, he is not connected with the world; he is not existent; he cannot receive the offerings that are made to him; there is therefore no benefit from presenting them, as he has no life, no being, *aprána*. None but a *rahat* can answer this argument of the *tirttakas*; therefore be pleased, venerable priest, to set aside this difficulty." Nágásena replied, "Budha has attained nirwána, in which there is no cleaving to existence; he does not receive the offerings that are presented; . . . nevertheless, those who make offerings to the relics of the Budhas, or listen to their bana, will receive the three great favours, viz. the happiness of this world, of the *déwa-lokas*, and of nirwána. . . . This benefit is gained, though Budha does not receive the offerings. Budha foresaw the things that would happen in future times, and he said to Ananda, 'Ananda, when I am gone, you must not think that there is no Budha; the discourses I have delivered, and the precepts I have enjoined, must be my successors, or representatives, and be to you as Budha.' Therefore, the declaration of the *tirttakas* that there is now no benefit from the presenting of offerings to Budha is utterly false; though he does not receive them, the benefit to the giver is the same as if he did. Again, does the earth say, 'Let such and such trees grow upon my surface?' Milinda: "No." Nágásena: "Then how is it that flowers, and buds, and shrubs, and trees, and creepers passing from one to the other, are produced?" Milinda: "The earth, though itself unconscious, is the cause of their production." Nágásena: "Even so, though Budha is now unconscious, he is nevertheless the source of benefit to those who seek his protection. That which is the opposite of evil desire, enmity, and ignorance, is thus like the root of merit set in the ground; the exercise of *samádhi* is like the trunk of the tree; the doctrines of the bana are like the hard wood in its heart; the four *sangwara* precepts are like the boughs and main branches; the five forms of knowledge called *wimukti*, that reveal the way in which emancipation is to be obtained, are like the colours and perfume of the flowers; and the fruition of the paths leading to nirwána is like the immortal fruit; and all this is brought about by Budha, though he has attained nirwána, and is unconscious. . . . Again, did you never hear of the *yaká* Nandaka, who struck the head of *Seriyut* with his hand, and the earth clove, and he went down to hell? Was this cleaving of

the earth brought about by the will and appointment of Seriyut?" Milinda: "No; this could not be; the world and all the beings that inhabit it might pass away; the sun and moon might fall to the earth, and Maha Méru be destroyed; but Seriyut could not will the endurance of sorrow by any being whatever; the rising of anger would at once be overcome by the virtue he possessed as a *rahat*; he could not be incensed even against his murderer. It was by the power of his own demerit that Nandaka was sent to hell." Nágaséna: "It was even so; but if this demerit, though unconscious, could cause the yaká to be taken to hell, so may merit, though also unconscious, cause those who possess it to be taken to a *déwa-loka*, and receive happiness. Thus, O king, when the *tirtakas* say, 'If Budha receives the offerings of men, he is yet in the world of sentient being; but if he has attained *nirwána*, he is unconscious, he cannot assist those who seek his protection; and there is therefore no benefit to be derived from the offerings that are made to him;' their argument is of no value, it is vain and deceitful." In this way the venerable priest answered the questions of the great king; like the man who shakes the branches of the jambu tree fifty *yojanas* in height, and succeeds in procuring its immortal fruit.—*Ibid.* pp. 228—232.

In all this it is not always easy to say whether the kings and sages are dealing with things or with mere words, nor to reconcile M. Huc with Mr. Spence Hardy, nor the somewhat conflicting expressions of Buddhist authorities with each other. Thus much, however, is clear, that Budha is the supreme object of worship, and *nirwána* the Supreme Good—the legitimate object of religious thought and action, and the state into which Budhas, *rahats*, and generally all who have accumulated the requisite amount of merit, are finally absorbed.

The great objects of religious worship and veneration appear to be what are called the 'Three Gems:' Budha, the Truth, and the Associated Priesthood, under whose protection the novice is placed on entering a religious life, and on whose perfections he is bidden to meditate.

'I take refuge in Budha;'

'I take refuge in the Truth;'

'I take refuge in the Associated Priesthood;'

is the 'threefold protective formula' which appears almost to answer to the baptismal creed of the Christian.

Dharmma, or the Truth, is of course the whole Buddhist system, formed round the original revelation of Gótama Budha, by an accretion of devotional and practical books, of various authority, and of definitive decisions issued *pro re nata*, as circumstances called them forth. The Associated Priesthood, as the name implies, are the body of Lamas, who are the depositaries and teachers of the truth, and to whom it would appear to be almost exclusively addressed.

It will be seen that in the system, as thus explained by Mr. Spence Hardy, the continual incarnations of the Deity, which form so prominent a feature in Tartar and Thibetan religion, in fact disappear. It is not that God approaches man, but that

some men raise themselves for a moment above their species, and then disappear—merged in the vast nothing upon which this form of Buddhism appears to concentrate itself. These men are the divine founders of systems or dispensations—they are charged with the exalted office (in Mr. Spence Hardy's words) 'of directing sentient beings to the path which leads to *nirvāna*,' but they are no more—they come and go, and are not.

The Budha to whom the present dispensation is due, and to whom it is referred as the centre of its faith and worship, was Gótama Budha, who was born about 2,500 years ago, in a country near Nepal, of which his father was king. Mr. Spence Hardy gives a summary of his life. His childhood was wondrous. 'At the moment of his birth he stepped upon the ground, and after looking around towards the four quarters, the four half quarters, above and below, without seeing any one in these ten directions who was equal to himself, he exclaimed, "I am the most exalted in the world; this is my last birth; hereafter there is to me no other existence."' He sat in the air when five months old, without any support; and his person bore the marks which betokened a supreme Budha. But although in previous lives innumerable, animal, human, and divine, he had set the office of Budha before him as the object of his ambition, and had continually disciplined himself for its reception, it was still necessary that this, his last human life, should be spent as a hermit. Crœsus-like, his father had been warned that to this life he would be led by the sight of four signs,—decrepitude, sickness, a dead body, and a recluse. Crœsus-like, he tried to avert them, but in vain. Each in their turn, they appeared: the loathsomeness of the three first taught Gótama to despise the world—the calm expression of the holy man's countenance taught him how to conquer it. The thought of an ascetic life fastened on his mind; and while he was meditating disturbedly on its excellences, his intentions were brought to a point by disgust at the disordered appearance and unseemly postures of his singing girls; who, failing to fix his attention by their music, had fallen asleep around him. After a look at his newly-born and only son, who was sleeping in the arms of his mother, he abandoned his palace and the world, for the forest of Uruwela. There he remained six years, passing through a course of continually increasing austerity, till his daily allowance of food was reduced to no more than a pepper pod. His body became greatly attenuated, and one night he fell senseless to the ground, from exhaustion. Before long, after withstanding a remendous onset from a formidable host of demons, 'under a Bò tree, near which Budha Gaya was afterwards built, he received the supreme Budhaship.'

‘At the tenth hour of the same night, he attained the wisdom by which he knew the exact circumstances of all the beings that have ever existed in the infinite worlds; at the twentieth hour he received the divine eyes, by which he had the power to see all things within the space of the infinite systems of worlds as clearly as if they were close at hand; and at the tenth hour of the following morning, or the close of the third watch of the night, he attained the knowledge by which he was enabled to understand the sequence of existence, the cause of all sorrow and its cessation. The object of his protracted toils and numerous sacrifices, carried on incessantly through myriads of ages, was now accomplished. By having become a Budha he had received a power by which he could perform any act whatever, and a wisdom by which he could see perfectly any object, or understand any truth, to which he chose to direct his attention.’—*Ibid.* p. 4.

He announced himself the teacher of the three worlds, wiser than the wisest, higher than the highest. He worked miracles; he preached to heavenly beings, and visited heavenly worlds; he endued thousands of his disciples with the power of suspending the laws of heaven and earth; and, finally, died at the age of eighty. From that time he has attained *nirvāṇa*, and is no more. His tooth is in possession of the British Government at Kandy—the impression of his foot is on Adam’s peak—his collar-bone is somewhere else. But his soul is nowhere; and we have seen that his disciples are left in the difficulty of having to explain in what sense he is now non-existent, and if non-existent, how he can still be a legitimate object of worship.

Even in this fantastic picture we can trace the same distorted likeness to Christianity which a dream bears to reality. In the person of Budha we see an unavailing struggle to reconcile the ideas of a spiritual and an incarnate God. We see in the holy Triad, Budha, the Truth, and the Associated Priesthood, a reflection of that Trinity which Christians worship—the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth—the Word and Wisdom of the Father,—and the Comforter, who inhabits the Church of Christ. We find a probation, a heaven, and a hell. But the likeness crumbles as we look upon it. As in the physical world, some gases, unless carefully purified from all foreign matter, and mixed with a scrupulous observance of time, proportion, and temperature, refuse to enter into the proper combination, and issue either in a coarse mechanical amalgamation, or some offensive chemical incongruity; so, in Budhism, the great elements of religious truth, jumbled up as it were with the prevailing doctrine of metempsychosis, and devoid of any clear apprehension of the Divine Personality, result not in a harmonious whole, but in a wild mixture of subtlety and grotesqueness, grandeur and littleness, precision and inconsistency. The idea of a spiritual Godhead melts into a metaphysical abstraction, while that of the Incarnation is swollen into creature-worship. The expressions which remind a Christian of the Holy Trinity

dwindle and dry up into a creature, a book, and an ecclesiastical polity, and it is not very easy to be sure that the final reward of human holiness, *nirvāṇa*, has any existence at all.

It follows to examine the imposing superstructure which in the course of centuries the subtlety and grandeur of oriental enthusiasm have erected on this narrow and delusive basis.

We take first the morality of this religion,—wonderful in itself, more wonderful in its analogy to Christianity, which here becomes more deep and substantial. It seems as if the minds which must have been continually working on this system, baffled in their attempts to reach God, had repaid themselves by the searching minuteness with which they had questioned physical nature and their own minds. This perhaps we should expect from Pantheism, which while it lowers the Deity from a supreme governor to an animating principle, brings out to exaggeration the truth that ‘in Him we live, and move, and have our being,’ considering the growth of a rush, though less magnificently, yet not less absolutely divine than the miracle of a saint, or the teaching of a Budha. Their moral system is the result of these questionings. It is full of trifling minuteness and unmeaning ceremonial, but its precepts do yet go firmly and searchingly to the bottom of morality. Abandonment of self, charity to our fellow-creatures, and subjugation not of the body only, but of the mind, are the foundation of the grotesque and heterogeneous superstructure.

This we shall proceed to illustrate. But we must first observe that the elaborate moral and ceremonial system propounded by Budhist authorities appears directly applicable to priests only. The great virtue prescribed to the layman, or ‘householder,’ as he is called, in contradistinction to the unmarried and mendicant priest, seems to be almsgiving; the merit of which varies, not only with the necessities, merits, and motives of the giver, but with the worthiness of the receiver:—

‘A hunter once gave alms to one who did not observe the precepts, in order to benefit his brother who was a *préta* sprite,’ (suffering, *i.e.* a kind of purgatory,) ‘but he derived no benefit therefrom. The hunter then gave alms to one who did observe the precepts, and his brother was released from the *préta*-birth.’—*Ibid.* p. 83.

The most trifling offering to a priest, or saint, if properly given, is followed by the most stupendous rewards; and some of the promises made to such gifts are of the coarse and extravagant kind by which a greedy priesthood is wont, and unhappily even a Christian priesthood has sometimes ventured, to raise money. Sometimes, however, this virtue is enforced by teaching of a more refined cast. The virtue of alms, we are told, is extinguished when they are given without thought or affection, or by

the hand of another, or are thrown to the receiver disdainfully, or given only after long intervals, or without any hope of a (providential or religious) reward. There is no reward for giving intoxicating liquors, or to indecent dancers or singers, or (more questionably) to tirttaka heretics. On the other hand, alms arising from personal labour are peculiarly meritorious, inasmuch that great kings have laboured with their hands that they might give the produce to priests.

'In the time of Dīpankara Budha, Gótama Bódhisat was a rich man in Benares, who gave alms in such abundance that the whole of Jambudwīpa was as if "all the ploughs had been hung up:" all persons ceased from labour. When Sekra saw this he became alarmed, (thinking that the merit of the rich man would be so great as to entitle him to receive the office he himself then held as ruler of a celestial world) and destroyed all his remaining substance, except a sickle, a cord, and a yoke. With these Bódhisat went to cut grass, resolving to give half his earnings to the poor; but when he saw so many in destitute circumstances he gave away the whole, and his wife and he had nothing to eat for the space of six days. At last he fainted away, when in the act of cutting grass. At this moment Sekra appeared to him, and offered to return him all his substance if he would cease to give alms; but he refused to make a promise to this effect. However, as Sekra now found out that he did not do this to obtain his throne in Tawutisá, he became propitious to him, and gave him an immensity of wealth.'—*Ibid.* pp. 88, 89.

The greatest gift which a householder can give to the service of religion is, of course, himself. Indeed, we find from Mr. Spence Hardy, that although it is possible to pass from the state of 'householder' to that of *nirwāna*, yet this cannot be unless the man has, in some previous existence, performed the priestly duties. The next gift in value is that of a child. We find that Budha, while on earth, refused to recognise as entire votaries of his own, men who had not devoted one of their offspring to the priesthood, and we shall see that the practice among the Tartars is, in this respect, in more than accordance with the ancient requirements of their religion.

But to proceed to the priesthood. We begin by quoting the 'ten obligations' which the novice is to fix in his mind before admission to the priesthood. One might imagine them put together by a person who had half-forgotten the Ten Commandments. We should point out that 'life' includes every form of animal life, which is almost equally sacred to the priest, and that the third injunction is not of chastity but celibacy.

'1. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the taking of life.

'2. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the taking of that which has not been given.

'3. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids sexual intercourse.

'4. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the saying of that which is not true.

'5. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the use of intoxicating drinks, that lead to indifference towards religion.

'6. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the eating of food after mid-day.

'7. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids attendance upon dancing, singing, music, and masks.

'8. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the adorning of the body with flowers, and the use of perfumes and unguents.

'9. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the use of high or honourable seats or couches.

'10. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the receiving of gold or silver.'—*Ibid.* p. 24.

Nor is a mere external submission sufficient. The following passage, in which our readers will remark the curious exuberance of illustration with which the Buddhist treatises are overlaid, shows also the nature of the obedience which they require.

'The precepts must be obeyed from a pure motive. Were any one to practise the Ten Obligations merely "to fill the belly," this man, deceiving the laity, greedy of fame, destitute of virtue, and unworthy to enjoy the privileges of the priesthood, will receive a double punishment; after death he will be born in the Awichi hell, where he will have to reside myriads of years, in the midst of flames, hot, fierce, and overpowering, in which he will be turned upside down, and in every possible direction, covered with foam. When released from this hell, he will be born in the hell of sprites, where he will have a body extremely attenuated, and most loathsome in its appearance, whilst he will have to endure the severest privations, and will have to walk upon earth in misery, the spectre of a priest. Just as when a man of ignoble appearance and inferior family, by some deception succeeds in being anointed king: but he is afterwards punished: his arms, legs, nose, and ears are cut off; the scalp is torn away, and boiling gruel poured on his head; his skull is rubbed with gravel until it is white as a sea-shell; a lighted brand being put in his mouth, his body is rubbed with oil and set on fire; his frame is hacked; he is thrown down, and a spike being driven from ear to ear, he is pinned to the ground; his flesh is torn with hooks, and cut with small pieces of metal like coins; the body is transfixed to the ground, and turned round and round by the legs, the pin serving as a pivot; he is flogged until his body is of the consistence of a wisp of straw; he is eaten by hungry dogs; his tongue is fastened to a stake, and he remains there until he dies; or he is beheaded. By these terrible allusions the novice is warned against becoming a recluse merely that he may secure a livelihood; and they may be received as illustrative of the modes of punishment then used.'—*Ibid.* pp. 32, 33.

Sometimes, however, their precepts have a condensed simplicity at once deeply practical and philosophical, which remind us of the keen and searching aphorisms of Thomas à Kempis. The following, for example, are quoted by Mr. Spence Hardy from a book called the 'Footsteps of Budha,'—in its very title a curious parallel to the 'Imitation of Christ.' The concluding passages invite a comparison with the words with which our Saviour concludes the Sermon on the Mount.

'Mind precedes action. The motive is chief: actions proceed from mind. If any one speak or act from a corrupt mind, suffering will follow the action as the wheel follows the lifted foot of the ox.

'Mind precedes action. The motive is chief: actions proceed from mind. If any one speak or act with a pure intention, enjoyment will follow the action, as the shadow attends the substance.

'Their anger is not subdued who recal to mind—he abused me, he struck me, he conquered me, he plundered me.

'But their anger is subdued who do not recal to mind—he abused me, he struck me, he conquered me, he plundered me.

'Anger will never be appeased by anger, but by gentleness. This is the doctrine of the ancients.

'Persons do not reflect, *We shall speedily die; if any do thus reflect, their quarrels speedily terminate.*

'He who lives regarding the pleasures of existence with unrestrained passions, immoderate in food, indolent, unpersevering, Mārāya (lust) will certainly subdue him, as the feeble tree is overturned by the blast.

'He who lives meditating on the evils of existence with restrained passions, temperate in food, religious, and persevering, Mārāya will certainly not overpower him, as the solid rock stands unmoved by the storm. . . .

'The worldly-minded man, who understands much of religion, and talks much concerning it, without keeping its precepts, is like a herdsman of other men's cattle, who is not partaker of the flock he tends.

'The pious man, who though he understands but little, and talks but little of religion, is an observer of its precepts; who removes lust, wrath, and folly far from him; who is considerate, possessed of a mind free from evil, and without attachments; he, in this world and that to come, is partaker of the fruits of piety.'—*Ibid.* pp. 28—30.

In the following passage, quoted by M. Huc from 'The forty-two precepts put forth by Budha,' we have exhibited, not without a certain imaginative grandeur, the one pervading thought of a religious mind—the nothingness of human life:—

'Budha asked of the *S'rāmanas*, How long is the life of man? They answered, It is but a few days. Budha said, You have not yet acquired knowledge of the doctrine.

'Then he turned to a *S'rāmana*, and asked, How long is the life of man? He answered, It is but time enough to take a meal. Budha said, Go, neither hast thou acquired knowledge of the doctrine.

'Then he turned to another *S'rāmana*, and asked, How long is the life of man? He answered, It is but time enough to draw a breath. When he had thus spoken, Budha said, It is well. Thou perhaps hast acquired knowledge of the doctrine.'—*Huc*, vol. ii. p. 152.

But how far short of that plaintive solemnity with which that same truth is proclaimed in Scripture; in words which are almost music to the eye, and seem, as it were, to appropriate for the expression of religious truth, at once the touching pathos of the Greek poet, and the majestic figures and sententious depth of the oriental sage!

'The voice said Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.'—Is. xl. 6—8,

In another passage from the same work we almost seem to recognise a human imitation, dry, indeed, and skeleton-like, but still terse and searching, of the solemn and pregnant sentences of Solomon:—

Budha, the supreme of beings, manifesting his doctrine, pronounced these words:—There are twenty difficult things under heaven. 1. Being poor and in need to confer benefits is difficult. 2. Being rich and high in rank to study doctrine is difficult. . . . 6. To dally with pleasure and to wish deliverance from our passions is difficult. 7. To see what is lovely and not to desire it is difficult. 8. Not to be drawn to what is lucrative and honourable is difficult. 9. To be reviled and not to be irritated is difficult. 10. In the bustle of affairs to conduct ourselves with calm is difficult. 11. To study much and to the bottom is difficult. 12. Not to despise an unlearned man is difficult. 13. To extirpate pride of heart is difficult. . . . 18. To persuade men to follow their conscience is difficult. 19. To keep the heart in an even movement is difficult. 20. Not to slander is difficult.'—*Huc*, vol. ii. p. 149.

Every reader must be struck by the weighty (may we not say scriptural?) simplicity of this morality. But at this point the Buddhist doctrines do not stop. Their views of celibacy, asceticism, and the contemplative life are singularly coincident with what we find in the later history of the Church. The true priest must extirpate from his heart all attachment to, all pleasure in, all observation of things earthly:—

'The priest is not to eat as a pastime, nor for pleasure, nor to make the body strong like the public wrestlers, nor to render it beautiful like the dancers. As a man with a falling house props it up—as a man with a broken wagon puts in a piece of wood, so may the priest eat to preserve his body, and prevent untimely death. As hunger is the most powerful of all the appetites, he may eat to ward it off.'—*Eastern Monachism*, p. 96.

But he must eat, if possible, with disgust, as a man would eat the flesh of his child to save his life. So the professional poverty, the contempt of domestic duties in comparison of the ascetic life—the exaggerated horror of woman, as if her very touch was pollution—the minuteness of observance—the subjection to precise and formal rules—the prolonged meditation suspending all other duties—and all the feats, or, as we must sometimes call them, pranks of asceticism, which we find in later Christianity, find their parallels, if not their caricatures, in Buddhism. It is perhaps in Buddhist hagiology that the most curious coincidences spring up. The following passage, for example, from the legend of Rathapála, with all its wild orientalism, will remind the reader of monastic legends of many similar incidents in the career of Romanist saints:—

'When Gótama Budha visited the different places in the province of Kuru, that he might confer benefits upon the people, he came to the brahman village of Thullakotthitan, so called on account of the numerous castles it contained, that were filled with all kinds of treasures. The people of the

village had embraced the doctrines of Budha. Among the rest there was a brahman of a respectable family called Rathapála, who came to Gótama when he visited the village, and requested that he might be admitted to the priesthood, as he said that it was difficult for him to act aright so long as he continued a laic. Budha inquired if his parents had given their consent, and when Rathapála said that he had not requested their permission, the sage made known to him that it was not his custom to receive any into the priesthood who had not gained the consent of their parents. The brahman then went to his parents, and told them that since he had heard the discourses of Budha it was his wish to become a priest; and he now requested their permission to carry this wish into effect. But his parents replied, "You are our beloved son—our only son; we have none older than you, none younger; you have lived in all happiness; you have enjoyed yourself; you know nothing of sorrow; remain contented; eat and drink whatever is cherishing or delicious; take to yourself a retinue of beautiful maidens; have dancing girls to amuse you; remain a householder; and gain merit by giving alms to the three gems. We cannot give you permission to embrace the priesthood; we do not wish you to become a priest even after we are dead, and cannot, therefore, give our consent whilst we are alive." Rathapála then said, "Unless I receive your permission, I will die here;" and having said this, he lay down upon the bare ground. The parents repeated their former declarations three several times, and entreated him to rise; but as he still continued silent, they went to some of his friends, informed them of the determination of their son, and asked them to come and try to persuade him to change it. The friends accordingly came to the place where he was, and thrice urged the same reasons as his parents to induce him to remain a laic; but he still remained silent. They then went to his parents, and telling them it was in vain to attempt to alter his resolution, said it would be better to give their consent; they would then be able to see him at intervals; but if they still refused their permission, he would die. To this advice they agreed, on condition that the person who ordained him would allow him to pay them a visit from time to time. When the friends informed Rathapála that his parents gave their consent, he arose, took some refreshment, and went to the residence of Budha, who admitted him to the priesthood on learning that his parents had granted their permission.

'Not long after Rathapála had thus renounced the world, he attained rahatship, and became, indeed, one of the chief of the rahats; after which he went to Budha, who was now resident at Rajagaha, and requested permission to go and see his parents according to the promise he had given. As his request was granted, he went to his native village, near which he remained in a garden called Migachíra, belonging to the king Kórawya. At the proper time, taking his alms-bowl, he went to the village to receive alms, after putting on his robe in such a way as to conceal his person. As he approached his own residence, in going regularly from house to house, his father was standing in the central door-way of the mansion, which had in all seven doors. When his father saw him in the distance he said, "This is one of the priests who took away from us our only and beloved son." No attentions were paid to him by any of the family; nor were any alms presented; abuse was all that he received. At that time the female slave of one of his relatives was taking some food made of barley, which had been boiled the previous night and become stale, in order to throw it away. When Rathapála perceived her intention, he told her it would be better to put it in his bowl. She accordingly did so; but when he held out his bowl to receive it, she had the opportunity of seeing his hands and feet, and from this, as well as from his voice, she knew that it was Rathapála. At once she went and informed his mother, who was overjoyed at receiving this

intelligence, and promised the slave that if it were true she should receive her freedom. The mother went and imparted the news to his father; and in the mean time Rathapála eat the stale food he had received. The father went to the place whither he had retired, and said to him, "Would it not be better to come and reside at your own house, than to eat food that has become stale?" Rathapála replied, "Householder, the priests are houseless; we do not reside in houses; I have already been to your house; no alms were given me; not even a kind word did I receive." The father again entreated his son to return; but he said it was needless, as he had already partaken of food. He was then invited to come on the following day; and though he remained silent, his father knew his intention. The mansion was fitted up for his reception in the most splendid manner, and the wife of Rathapála was commanded to put on her most beautiful ornaments.

The next day, Rathapála was informed that all was ready, and he went to his former dwelling. His father displayed before him all his wealth, and said to him, "This is the property of your mother; this belongs to your father; the rest was inherited from our ancestors. Illustrious Rathapála, take possession of all this, become a laic once more, and gain merit by the giving of alms." But he replied, "If my advice were followed, all this gold, and all these jewels, and this wealth, would be placed upon wagons, taken to the Ganges or the Yamuna, and thrown into the stream: for they cause only sorrow, lamentation, grief, distress, and disappointment." His wife then held him by the feet and said, "Have you abandoned the world for the sake of some celestial nymph? If so, tell me, what is the manner of her appearance?" He replied, "Yes; it is for the sake of a celestial nymph that I have abandoned the world." On hearing this she fell down in a fit, from the excess of her grief.¹ Rathapála then said to his father, "If I am to receive food, let it be given; do not distress me by showing me wealth, or by the approach of women." His father informed him that all was prepared, and presented the food with his own hand, until he was satisfied. He then took the bowl, and preparing to depart, said, "The body is arrayed in garments and ornamented by jewels; it is like an image beautifully painted; it has hands, feet, and various members, is built about with flesh, and is subject to disease and decay; think about it well; if it

¹ While these sheets are passing through the press, our eye falls on an Italian street-ballad, presenting an odd coincidence with this incident in Rathapála's story.

FATTO ACCADUTO IN PALERMO.

In cui si narra come una Dama per malinteso sospetto di gelosia, credendo il marito infedele, si uccide; e torna in vita per miracolo istantaneo fatto da Dio per intercessione della Beatissima Vergine.

“ In sua Casa un Cavaliere
Di Maria divoto aveva
L' Oratorio, ivi soleva
Far sue preci notte, e dì
Or la moglie, ch' ogni notte
Il Marito alzar sentia
Pien di rabbia, e gelosia
Disse un giorno a lui così.

“ Sposo mio, forse altra Donna
Ami tu? ” “ L' amo davvero ”
Sorridente il Cavaliere
Alla Dama replicò

“ A una amabile Signora
Io donai tutto il mio core
Ed il tenero mio amore
A lei sempre serberò.”

“ Per colei dunque ogni notte
Tu ti parti! ” ella riprese
E con sua gran pena intese
Che colui non lo negò.
Restò muta, e disperata,
E la notte appresso udito
Il marito già partito
Prese un ferro, e si ammazzò.”

Then follows, similarly versified, the account of the miraculous revival, in answer to the husband's prayers.

were not for the manner in which it is ornamented, it would be loathsome; men and women have affection for this vile and perishing body, and none for nirvána. The body is washed in perfumed water; the hair is braided in eight different ways, and ornamented with coronets; and the eyes are anointed with collyrium; but nirvána is despised. Householder! you are like a man who places a gin made of withs to catch deer; you have displayed before me this wealth that I might be ensnared; but I am like the deer that eats the grass and escapes the snare; I have partaken of your food, and now depart." Having spoken these words he went away.—*Ibid.* pp. 38—41.

Still more curiously minute is the following parallel (presented to us by Mr. Spence Hardy) between the proceedings of the Buddhist priest Chittagutta, and the Western saints Peter of Alcantara, and Lewis of Gonzaga. We place them in parallel columns:—

'There was another priest, Chittagutta, who resided in the Karandu-léna, a cave in the southern province of Ceylon, upon the walls of which were painted, in a superior manner, the stories of the Budhas. The cave was visited by some priests, who greatly admired the paintings, and expressed their admiration to Chittagutta; but he replied, that he had lived there sixty years, and had never seen them, and that he should not now have known of their existence, if it had not been for their information. There was near the door of the cave a large ná-tree; but he only knew that the tree was there from the fall of the pollen and flowers. The tree itself he never saw, as he carefully observed the precept not to look upwards or to a distance. . . . When [on returning from a visit to a king] some other priests expostulated with him, for not being more respectful, and told him that he ought to have said, "May you prosper, great king! May you prosper, illustrious queens!" he replied that he knew not to whom he was speaking; he had not even noticed that they were persons of rank. On arriving at the cave, he walked at night to exercise the rite of meditation, when the *déwa* of the ná-tree caused a light to shine, by which the greatness of his abstraction was perceived, and the deities of the rocks around called out in approval. During the same night he became a *rahat*. From this may be learnt the benefit of keeping the eyes from wandering; they must not be permitted to roll about, like those of a monkey, or of a beast of the forest when in fear, or of a child; they must be directed downwards.'—*Ibid.* pp. 52, 53.

'Peter of Alcantara, who died in the year 1562, in order that his eyes might be more easily kept under the government of reason, and that they might not, by superfluous curiosity, break in upon the interior recollection of his mind, put them upon such restraint, that he had been a considerable time a religious man, before he knew that the church of his convent was vaulted. After having had the care of serving the refectory for half a year, he was chid by the superior for having never given the friars any of the fruit in his custody, to which the servant of God humbly answered, that he had never seen any. The truth was, he had never lifted up his eyes to the ceiling where the fruit was hanging upon twigs, as is usual in countries where grapes are dried and preserved. He lived four years in a convent without taking notice of a tree which grew near the door. He told S. Theresa that he had lived three years in a house of his order without knowing any of the friars but by their speech, as he never lifted up his eyes; if he did not follow the other friars, he was unable to find his way to many places that he frequented. It is said of Lewis Gonzaga, 1591, that although he every day waited on the Infant of Spain, James, and had to pay his respects to the empress, he never looked at her face, or took notice of her person.'—*Ibid.* p. 55.

The character of this highly-prized meditation, and the mode in which it is carried on, is sufficiently important to deserve special illustration. It appears strongly in the account of the discipline of the Noviciate. The novice's first step is, with certain ceremonies, to learn the 'threefold protective formularies,' and the ten obligations already mentioned, the Creed and Ten Commandments of the Buddhist. The mode in which his day must then be spent is detailed with a singular precision in a passage extracted by Mr. Spence Hardy from a manual called the *Dina Chariyāwa*, or daily observances of the priest. We would call attention particularly to the mixture of trifling observance with serious self-examination, religious thought, and practical discipline in kindness, justice, and humility:—

'He who, with a firm faith, believes in the religion of truth, rising before daylight, shall clean his teeth, and shall then sweep all the places that are proper to be swept, such as the court-yard, the platform near the *Bó-tree*, and the approaches to the *wihára*; after which he shall fetch the water that is required for drinking, filter it, and place it ready for use. When this is done, he shall retire to a solitary place, and for the space of three hours¹ meditate on the obligations, considering whether he has kept them or not. The bell will then ring, and he must reflect that greater than the gift of 100 elephants, 100 horses, and 100 chariots, is the reward of him who takes one step towards the place where worship is offered. Thus reflecting, he shall approach the *dágoba* (a conical erection under which some relic is placed) or the *bó-tree*, and perform that which is appointed; he shall offer flowers, just as if *Budha* were present in person, if flowers can be procured; meditate on the nine virtues of *Budha*, with a fixed and determined mind; and having worshipped, seek absolution for his negligences and faults, just as if the sacred things (before which he worships) had life. Having risen from this act of reverence, he shall proceed to the other places where worship is offered, and spreading the cloth or skin that he is accustomed to place under him, he shall again worship (with his forehead to the ground, and touching the ground with his knees and toes). The next act that he is required to perform is to look at his *lita*, or calendar, in order that he may learn the *awach'háwa* (the length of the shadow, by which, according to rules regularly laid down, varying with the time of the year, the hour of the day may be known), the age of the moon, and the years that have elapsed since the death of *Budha*; and then meditate on the advantages to be derived from the keeping of the obligations, carrying the alms-bowl, and putting on the yellow robe. It will now be time for him to take the alms-bowl, and when going his round, he is to bear in mind the four *karmas-thānas*, not to go too near, nor to keep at too great a distance from his *upádyā* or preceptor; at a convenient distance from the village, having swept a small space clean, he is properly to adjust his robe. If going with his *upádyā* or preceptor, he is to give the bowl into his hands, and accompany him to the village, carefully avoiding the sight of women, men, elephants, horses, chariots, or soldiers. According to the rules contained in the *Sékhiyá*, he is to proceed along the road; and after the alms have been received, he is to retire from the village in the manner previously declared. Taking the bowl and outer robe of his superior, he shall then proceed to the *wihára*. If there be a place appointed for the robe, he shall put it there

¹ There are sixty hours in one day.

after folding it; then place a seat, wash his feet, inquire if he is thirsty, place before him the tooth-cleaner, and bring the alms-bowl, or if this be refused, a small portion of rice. The stanzas must be repeated that are appointed to be said before eating, after eating, and when the things are received that may be used as sick diet; and the food is to be eaten in the manner laid down in the *Sékhiyá*. Then taking the bowl of his superior he shall wash it, put it in the sunshine to dry, and deposit it afterwards in its proper place. This being done, he is to wash his own face, and putting on his robe, he is first to worship his superior, and then Budha. The next act is to go again to some solitary place, and there repeat the appointed stanzas, considering whether he has omitted the practice of any obligation, or in any way acted contrary to them, after which he must exercise *maitri-bhāwanā*, or the meditation of kindness and affection. About an hour afterwards, when his weariness is gone, he is to read one of the sacred books or write out a portion of one; and if he has anything to ask from his preceptor, or to tell him, this is the time at which it should be done. In some convenient place the *bana* is to be read; and when this is concluded, if there be time before the setting of the sun, he is again to sweep the courtyard, &c. as before.

One by one each day, in regular order, the *sāmanéra* novices shall kindle a fire, light a lamp, make all ready for the reading of the *bana*, call the priest who is appointed to recite it, wash his feet, sit down in an orderly manner and listen to the *bana*, and then repeat the *pirit*, or ritual of priestly exorcism. Having done whatever is necessary to be done for the guru, and offered him worship, if the novice has doubts respecting any matter, he must ask to have them solved; or if accustomed to read the sacred books as a lesson, it must now be done, and he must repeat the *Sékhiyá* and *Chatupārasudhi-sīla*. If there be in the same *wihāra* a priest older than himself, he is to render him all necessary assistance, such as to wash his feet, and anoint them with oil, and after offering to him worship, he must ask permission to retire. Reclining in the place where he intends to sleep, he is again to repeat the four stanzas and the four *karmasthānas*, as before, and reflect that in the morning he will have to rise. Having slept, he is to rise in the morning before daybreak, and after again repeating the four stanzas and the four *karmasthānas*, he must repeat the *pirit* taken from the *Ratana-sūtra*, exercise *maitri-bhāwanā*, and do all that is required to be done. In the morning, as well as at night, he is to reflect on the eight things that produce sorrow, on the infirmities of the body, on death, and on all that is declared in the *Dasa-dhamma-sūtra*. Not giving his mind to the four things that lead to hell, viz. evil desire, anger, fear, and ignorance, should he know that any priest in the community has committed an error, he must go and declare it to him in a friendly manner, by which he will derive the benefit that follows right speech. If there be a priest who lives according to the precepts, and is obedient thereto, he is like one who does personal service to Budha; he honours Budha, acknowledges that he is supreme, and offers to him that which is the most excellent *pūjā*, or oblation. The *sāmanéra* is then to reflect whether he has rightly attended to the *Dina Chariyāwa*; if he has done so, he must remain silent upon the subject, saying nothing about it; but if he finds that he has neglected obedience in any one particular, and is examined by the guru, he shall confess his fault. When anything has been done without due consideration, inadvertently, he is to bring a measure of sand, and sprinkle it in the sacred court. He must at all times be ready to do that which is necessary to be done for his preceptor, and to the more aged priests he must be respectful and obedient, washing their feet without any pride. With the four articles that he has received as a novice, of what kind soever they may be, whether good or bad, he must rest contented; nor must he covet to have anything

more than the allowed requisites of the priesthood. Maintaining a course of good behaviour, he must keep under the five senses, with matured wisdom, and without any haughtiness of either body, speech, or mind. He must not associate with those who are not ascetics, nor follow their customs; and he must be careful to avoid the commission of the least crime. By this means he will render an oblation worthy of Budha, the ruler of the world. This is the Dina Chariyáwa.'—*Ibid.* pp. 24—27.

The contrivances by which the attention is to be fixed on the object of meditation are sometimes whimsical, sometimes loathsome. In many of them a distinct purpose is visible, which is carried out sometimes with a kind of imaginative force and wildness, sometimes with a subtle and business-like inventiveness, which we often find in Roman Catholic books of devotion, when they have to grapple with a corrupt tendency of the human heart. Sometimes, however, the forms pursued are simply and inconceivably absurd. The following is the process by which the priest is to attain *nimitta*, or 'illumination,' a state apparently of half trance or ecstasy. He must begin by selecting a proper locality, and placing in it a tablet of properly prepared clay. He must then

'take water that falls from a rock, and therewith render the clay perfectly smooth and even, like the head of a drum; then, having bathed, he must sweep the place where the frame is erected, and place a seat, without any irregularities, on its surface, one span and four inches high, at the distance of two cubits and one span from the frame. Remaining upon this seat, he must look at the circle, and exercise meditation. If the seat be further distant than the prescribed space, he will not be able to see the circle properly; and if nearer, its imperfections will be too apparent. If it be higher, he will have to bend his neck to see the circle; if lower, his knees will be pained. Thus seated, he must reflect on the evils resulting from the repetition of existence, and on the manner in which it is to be overcome; on the benefits received by those who practice the dhyānas and other modes of asceticism; and on the excellences of the three gems; and he must resolve upon securing the same advantages. He must not keep his eyes open too long, lest he become confused. The circle must be seen, but not too clearly, or his object cannot be gained; still, it is necessary that it be seen with a certain degree of distinctness, or his aim will be equally frustrated. He must be like a man who watches an elephant, not too intent, nor too careless; or, like a man looking at himself in a mirror, who does not notice the form of the instrument, but regards his own appearance alone. The colour of the circle must be noticed, but not with too much pleasure or satisfaction. It is not enough to think that it is composed of earth. The priest must also remember that the earthly particles of his own body are composed of the same element. For this purpose he must think of the different names that are given to earth, such as pathawi, mahi, médini, bhūmi, wasudhá, and wasundará. Any of these names may be chosen, and, for a time, he may reflect on that exclusively; but as the epithet most commonly used is pathawi, upon this he must meditate with greater frequency and intensity. Until nimitta is received, sometimes with his eyes open, and at other times with them shut, he must continually regard the circle, though the exercise has to be repeated a hundred or a thousand times. When the circle appears to the mind as clearly with the

eyes shut as 'with them open, the nimitta may be regarded as accomplished.'—*Ibid.* pp. 254, 255.

The exercise must not be continued after *nimitta* has been gained, or it will be lost again. The circle, when it has accomplished its object, will only distract the attention. The priest, therefore, is to go home in his state of illumination, and then meditate afresh. The following form of meditation, loathsome as it is, has a more visible purpose in it, reminding one of the skull and cross-bones of the Christian hermit. It is the meditation in a cemetery on the offensive parts of a dead body :—

'He must go to the place of meditation with joy; as a king goes to the hall where he is to be anointed, or a brahman to the yāga sacrifice, or a poor man to the place where there is hidden treasure. He may take with him a staff to drive away dogs and wild beasts. In the exercise, he must turn his eyes and ears inward, and must not allow them to wander after anything that is without, save that he must remember the direction in which he came. In approaching the body he must not come from the leeward, or he may be overpowered by the smell, and his mind will become confused; but if there be in the other direction any rock, fence, water, or other hindrance, he may approach the body from the leeward, provided he cover his nostrils with the corner of his robe. In fixing his eyes on the body, he must look athwart the course of the wind; he must not stand near the head or the feet, but opposite the abdomen; not too near, or he may be afraid, nor too far off, or the offensive properties will not rightly appear. He must meditate on the colour of the body: its sex, age, and different members, joints, and properties; that this is the head, this the abdomen, and that these are the feet; and he must pass in order to the different parts of the body, and number every joint, from the foot to the head. Thus, in relation to the hair of the head, the following reflections must be made :— "It is different to all other parts of the body, . . . it is in every respect impure; when not regularly cleaned, it becomes offensive; and when thrown into the fire it sends forth a disagreeable smell." Fixing his eyes on the body, he must think a hundred and a thousand times on its offensiveness . . . And at times he must shut his eyes and think inwardly and intensely on the same subjects. All dead bodies are alike; the body of the king cannot be distinguished from that of the outcaste, nor the body of the outcaste from that of the king.'—*Ibid.* pp. 248, 249.

Here is another method :—

'He who rightly perceives that all continued existence is sorrow, choosing the root of some tree in a solitary part of the forest, sits under it with his feet bent up and his body straight; then collecting his thoughts, with a calm mind he makes an inspiration and an expiration of the breath. Drawing a long breath through the nostrils, he notices, I have thus drawn a long breath. Breathing a long spiration from the nostrils, he notices, I have thus breathed a long spiration from the nostrils. Drawing a short breath through the nostrils, he notices, I have drawn a short spiration through the nostrils. Reflecting that the beginning, the middle, and the end of every kind of breath is from the body, he resolves, with a wise mind I will draw an inspiration; with a wise mind I will breathe out an expiration. In a manner so as not to fill the cavity of the nose, restraining the violence or magnitude of

his breath, he makes an inspiration, and noticing, I thus make an inspiration; he disciplines his mind; then making an expiration, he notices, I thus make an expiration. Reflecting on the joy connected with the exercise of the first dhyána, and causing its production, he thus makes an inspiration and an expiration . . . Indulging comprehensive thoughts, he makes an inspiration and an expiration. Restraining comprehensive thoughts, he makes an inspiration and an expiration."—*Ibid.* p. 267.

And so he goes on inspiring and expiring through various internal exercises of charity, and a series of meditations on the impermanency of things earthly, the various forms of evil desire, and other religious subjects.

But a really lofty and searching morality is embodied in the Maitri bhawána, or meditation of kindness already mentioned. When the priest finds it difficult to exercise this meditation upon his enemy, all the different expedients of charity are one after another put in use. He is to remember how in his enemy good is mixed with, and may be disguised by bad; he is to think only of the good, and not of the bad; if there is no good, he is to consider with pity how his enemy will suffer for his wickedness; if this will not do, he is to think of the rewards of benevolence, or the consequences to himself of indulging hatred. 'He who indulges in enmity is like one who throws ashes to 'windward, which come back to the same place, and cover him 'all over.' He may be born in hell for it. Then he is to remember that in some anterior life his present enemy may have been his father, brother, friend, or benefactor. 'If all these reflections are insufficient, the priest must think, "What am I 'at enmity with? Is it with the hair, or with the bones, or with 'what?" Thus his hatred will have nothing upon which to fasten, 'even as nothing can be placed upon the mustard-seed, or 'painted upon the air.' . . . 'There is yet one more expedient. The 'priest must give something to his enemy, or must receive from 'him, if he is willing to give it. And in this manner even should 'the enmity have existed from previous ages, it will be overcome.' Minute and fanciful as they may be called, there is a remarkable purpose and ingenuity about this series of expedients for reaching the heart; and in the last a curious and just appreciation of the pride of human enmity. Nor is the benefit of this exercise confined to human beings. In the eye of the pantheist, every form of life is divine; and the Buddhist hagiology extends accordingly to animals:—

'Whilst a cow was giving suck to its calf, a hunter tried to pierce it with a javelin, but his efforts were in vain; he could not take its life. It was not by the power of samádhi, or any other attainment, that this took place; it was from the affection manifested towards its offspring at the moment; and in this way may be learnt the greatness of the meditation of kindness.'—*Ibid.* p. 246.

But while the priest applies his mind, with a curious mixture of subtlety and wildness, seriousness and whimsicality, to human duties and the natural world, we are impressed throughout (at least in the representations of Mr. Spence Hardy) with the absence of a personal God. The system appears 'groaning and travailing,'—the persons seem to be feeling about if haply they may find Him who is so near to them—clinging to what they have of good—straining after something unearthly and exalted, sometimes better, sometimes worse than themselves—inconsistent and tottering in their views when most approaching the truth. But a veil appears to separate them even from a tangible, dogmatical and substantial Theism. As in a dream we pass through all the anticipations and preliminaries of a pageant, but when the great sight should be actually present, our imagination seems to break down, and an unaccountable film spreads itself before our eyes—so Buddhism seems to falter and break down as it approaches the doctrine of a God. We have before us a confused and wonderful mass of the circumstances, consequences, and paraphernalia of belief, but the object of that belief is strangely unsubstantial. The priest exercises his mind in love towards all beings—and specifically towards his enemies, the poor, and the deserving. We learn in detail how he is to dwell on the priestly decalogue, the vanity of physical existence, the loathsomeness of the human frame, the natural world and its moral uses, and the benefits of ascetic abstraction. But little appears of meditation on God. We are only told, shortly, that the novice is to meditate on the nine virtues of Budha, and the priest on 'the excellencies of the three gems.' What constitutes this direct meditation on that Being, which, if anything, is the Deity, or on what it is to take hold, does not appear, either from the writings of Mr. Spence Hardy or from those of M. Huc. Here is the all-important contrast between Buddhism and Christianity, which, as we know, especially consists in devotion to a person—the person of Christ. And this contrast blends everywhere with the parallel which we are now drawing between Buddhism and Rome, whether we regard the latter in her dignity, her trifling, or her corruptions.

The following passage from Cardinal Bona's '*Via Compendii ad Deum*,' sweeps, as it were, along the whole subject of mystical meditation:—

'Alvarez enumerates fifteen phrases relating to contemplation, as explaining its different stages; they are these:—The intuition of truth; the retirement of the soul to its interior; spiritual silence; rest; union; hearing the voice of God; spiritual sleep; ecstasy; rapture (*raptus*); the corporal appearance of Christ and the Saints; their imaginary appearance; the intellectual vision; the vision of God in darkness; the admirable vision of God relieved from darkness; the clear and intuitive vision of God, which,

although proper to the Saints, has yet, as some theologians properly teach, been given to some very holy men even in this life.'

And the practical details of meditation are laid down with the same accurate minuteness with which the subject is mapped out. Perhaps the most remarkable application of this system is to be found in the 'Spiritual Exercises' of Ignatius Loyola, which are said to exert an almost incredible power over the minds of those who are subjected to them. The careful and searching rules which stand at the opening of that book exhibit Rome in her dignity and power. It is difficult to extract from so coherent a course of teaching. But we will take a few passages. First, as to the preparation for meditation:—

'Cap. II. § 2.—Immediate preparation for Meditation.

'While yet a pace or two distant from the spot where he is to meditate, let him, for about long enough to recite the Lord's prayer, think of his Lord Jesus as God and man, or of the Most Holy Trinity, or (lest his fancy should wander) let him perform as perfect an act of faith as he can, and believe in a lively manner that God is before him, looking upon what he is about to do, to whom he should do reverence with humble gestures, first bowing, and then kneeling before God, of whose Divine presence he should, as far as he can, consider himself most unworthy, and should lament because of his unworthiness and his sins; yet, relying on the mercy of God, let him then offer himself and all he has, by a preparatory prayer, as above laid down.

'Observe that all this immediate preparation may and ought to be done in a very short time, being, as it were, only a kind of introduction to the meditation and not its principal fruit.'

* * * * *

'§ 4.—The disposition of the body before Meditation.

'He may now begin the contemplation itself from the first head of thought, now prostrate on the ground with his face either upwards or downwards; now sitting or standing in the posture in which he hopes most easily to compass what he desires; wherein these two points should be observed. First, that if he obtains his desire while kneeling, or in any other posture, he should so remain. Secondly, that he should rest upon that head of meditation by which he has obtained the devotion which he seeks, without attempting to proceed further, until he has fully satisfied himself.

'Note, that this disposition of body, which is here prescribed for the beginning of the meditation, is only to be used at home and alone; never in church or before others, where he should adopt only that posture which is customary in public worship.'

The following again are three modes of prayer, or rather of devotional thought, for those who are not equal to more sustained meditation:—

'Cap. VI. § 1.—Of the first method of Prayer.

'The first method of praying is by a short consideration of the precepts of God and the Church, of the seven deadly sins, of the three powers of the soul and of the five senses of the body, in the following manner:—

'First, of the precepts, reflecting how he may have failed to keep them, and proposing to keep them better in future. Secondly, of the sins, reflect-

ing how easily he has committed them, and determining in future to avoid them more diligently. Thirdly, of the powers of the mind and the senses, observing how he has used them amiss, and concluding thenceforth to imitate Christ or His Mother in the use of them.

* * * * *

‘ § 3.—*Of the second method of Prayer.*

‘The second method of prayer is this, that kneeling or sitting (according to our bodily habit and devotion of mind), and our eyes either shut or fixed on one point, and not moving hither and thither, we should recite the words of some prayer, and pause upon the first word, until various meanings, analogies, spiritual savours, and other devout emotions arise in our minds; and so we should proceed onwards through all the words of the prayer.

‘On the conclusion of any prayer an address must be made to that person to whom it had relation.’

* * * * *

‘ § 5.—*Of the third method of Prayer.*

‘The third method of prayer is this, that we should utter each word of a prayer between each breath that we take, considering in the mean time either the meaning of the word, or the dignity of the person to whom it relates, or our own vileness, or, lastly, the distance between us.

‘This method is of use to give us a habit of saying prayers with fitting attention and devotion, following the saying of the Apostle, “I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.” Wherefore this exercise is very profitable for those who are bound to observe the canonical hours or other forms of prayer.’

We need hardly draw attention to the points of detail in which these extracts run curiously parallel with those which we have made from Buddhist books. We quote them as far more instructively illustrating the force and elevation which the Christian teacher derives from the distinctness of his aim and the personality of the object of his devotion.

The same contrast appears when we descend to less admirable characteristics of the Roman system. Buddhism trifles in its minute physical investigations and analogies—its catalogues of the parts and characteristics of the human body—of colours, forms, and properties. It informs us that the human frame is composed of 360 bones, 900 veins, and as many muscles—it bids us meditate on the parts of the body and the names of the earth—it encourages elaborate disputations on a fowl’s gizzard. Rome, on the contrary, dwells with a painful, sometimes shocking minuteness on the circumstances of those persons whom she venerates, from the greatest downwards. This perhaps is most shown in the stories which are produced for the use of the vulgar. We take one with some reluctance from a scrap of paper which lies before us, picked up at hazard in an Italian town, for which it is fair to say the authorities are no further responsible than in allowing it to be printed at Rome with the words ‘*Con approv.*’ at the bottom.

'Account given by our Lord Jesus Christ to the sisters Elizabeth, Martha, and Bridget, who desired to know some particulars of his passion, and to whom he appeared when they had finished their prayer, and said:—

'First know, my dear sisters, that I received 112 blows on the cheeks; I had 3 blows upon the mouth when I was taken in the garden; as I went to the house of Annas I fell 7 times; I was thrown upon the ground 105 times; I had 180 strokes upon the back, 32 blows upon the legs; I was lifted up by the beard and the hair of my head 32 times; I received 1 mortal thrust; at the column I received 6,666 stripes; I breathed 126 sighs; I was drawn and dragged about 33 times; I had 100 wounds in my head; I had 3 mortal wounds upon the cross; they spit in my face 52 times; they gave me 1,000 wounds; there were 300 soldiers who took me, 3 who carried me when I was bound; and I shed 38,514 drops of blood. I will grant 5 graces to the souls of those who will say 7 Paters and Aves daily for the space of 23 years and 12 days, which will complete the number of the drops of my blood. 1. I will give to them plenary indulgence and the remission of all their sins. 2. The pains of purgatory shall not hurt them. 3. If they die before the aforesaid time, I will do to them as if they had completed it. 4. I will treat them as if they had died martyrs and had shed their blood for the faith. 5. I will come from heaven at the hour of their death to receive their souls into my arms, and to all in their houses and to their relations to the fourth degree, and if they are in purgatory, I will take them thence to enjoy the heavenly country of life eternal.

'This account was found in the holy sepulchre, and whoever bears it about him will be secure from the devil, and from all bad death. And if a pregnant woman carries it about her, she will have an easy delivery.'

The coarse particularity of this passage, (claiming, be it observed, Divine origin,) would be completely in place among the grosser superstitions of Buddhism—scarcely less so than it would be out of place if appended to the majestic narrative of the Gospel or the pathetic anticipations of Jewish prophecy. To a Christian it is made more revolting than heathenism by that very circumstance which is the elevating element of Loyola's spiritual exercises—the directness with which it fastens itself on the person of our Lord.

Again, take the following passage, in which the beautiful sentence ascribed to the Abbot Macarius shines like a jewel in a heap of glass beads:—

'On this subject (of ejaculatory prayer) much may be drawn from the lives of the Fathers. The Abbot Isaiah saw the prayer of a certain monk, while he was eating, rise like a flame of fire into the sight of God. Another person offered 103 prayers while he was talking with others. The Abbot Macarius, when consulted by some as to the mode of praying, said, "There is no need to say much in prayer; but frequently to stretch out our hands and say, Lord, as Thou wilt and knowest, have mercy upon me." Moses the Ethiopian, formerly a chief of robbers, said 50 prayers daily. The monk Paul, 300. A certain virgin, 700. Theodoret relates that Simeon Stylites said numberless prayers daily, so that a man counted once 1,244, leaving out others, because he lost himself and left off counting. Father D. Martinez said *Deo gratias* 600 times, and exhorted others to do the same, saying that no prayer was shorter, none more pleasing to God. A member of the Society of Jesus, Jacobus Certulus by name, offered every day innumerable acts of love and thanksgiving, which sometimes amounted

to 24,000, and renewed his vows 3,000 times a-day. There were some persons, under the direction of Father Gonsalvus Sylveria, who asked the Divine assistance 10,000 times a-day, in a short prayer.'

Most readers will be surprised at the ledger-like minuteness with which these prayers are posted, reminding us of the 'at per 100' of mercantile phraseology. But it is not the less to be noticed that, unlike the observances of Buddhism, they are all direct supplications addressed by a human being to the Person of his Maker.

But we must go somewhat further. It not unnaturally follows from the impersonal character of Buddhism that those high powers of saving souls and removing mountains which Christ imparted to ardent faith in Him, are ascribed by the Buddhist to a certain transcendental grasp or appreciation of truth. Sometimes this truth is of a religious character, and apprehended by a religious man; but sometimes not. The following is perhaps an instance of the former kind:—

'On a certain day, when Maha Tissa resided in the rock Chétiya, he went to the city of Anurádhapura to receive alms, and in the way met a female who had quarrelled with her husband, and was returning in consequence to her parents. She was a beautiful woman, and arrayed in a very splendid manner. Wishing to attract the attention of the priest, she smiled; but by so doing she showed her teeth, and on seeing them he thought only of the impermanence of the body; by which means he attained *rahatship*. Soon afterwards he met her husband in the street, who asked him if he had seen a woman; but he replied that he had seen only a loathsome skeleton; whether it were that of a male or female he could not tell.'—*Eastern Monachism*, p. 52.

But sometimes the same miraculous energy is ascribed to the mere vigorous enunciation of a base formula, by a base person; powerful only because it is true and because it is put forth with a certain inexplicable force of belief. This at least is the best explanation which suggests itself for such a story as the following most singular one:—

'There was once a courtesan, Bindumati, who turned the course of the mighty Ganges by the force of this spell, founded upon the manner in which she exercised her base vocation. "The king," according to the original authority, "hearing the rushing sound of the reflux river, being greatly astonished, inquired of his chiefs; Friends, why does the current of the great Ganges flow backwards? They replied: Great king, the courtesan, Bindumati, has recited the *satcha kiriya*, in consequence of which the Ganges flows back to its head. The astonished king hastened to the courtesan, and said: Is it true that by the *satcha kiriya*, you have turned the course of the Ganges? When she replied: Yes, your majesty: he asked: Whence have you that power? Who will receive your declaration? By what power can an insignificant person like you cause the stream of the Ganges to flow backward? She replied: Great king, I caused the stream to flow back by the power of truth (*satcha*). The king said: What power of truth have you, a thief, vile, immodest, sinful, an overstepper of all restrictions, one who leads astray the blindly lascivious?

The courtesan confessed that she was all the king had named, but said that it was by the following truth-spell she had turned the stream of the Ganges, and that by the same power she could overturn the heavens; 'Does any one give me wealth, be he a prince, a brahman, a merchant, a labourer, or of any other tribe; whatever they may be, I receive them equally: the prince is not preferred, the labourer is not despised: contented, and free from regarding pleasure or pain, I follow the owner of wealth.'—*Ibid.* pp. 279, 280.

Christians might have hoped that their religion would furnish no parallel to such a fable as this; but the hope would be disappointed. Error bears corruption, as a vein of rottenness throws out poisonous fungi. A Protestant will not be surprised to see that the saint worship into which Rome has 'developed' the personal element of Christianity, has produced legends more shocking to morality than that which we have quoted from the *Sútra Pitaka*; and for this we may unhappily appeal, not to a street ballad or unauthorized fly-leaf, but to an unimpeachable authority in the Roman communion. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori is, perhaps, one of the writers most venerated and most influential in the modern Roman Church. He was born towards the end of the seventeenth century, and in the year 1802 his works were examined at Rome with a view to his canonization. It was duly reported *nihil censurâ dignum fuisse repertum*, and after all the necessary steps, approved in every stage by the Congregation of Sacred Rights and the Pope, his canonization was decreed in the year 1830. His biographer tells us that his devotion to the Virgin was considered by the pope a special element in his merit, (*Vita di S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori*, Roma, 1839, p. 380,) if so, the book from which the following extracts are taken—the *Glorie di Maria*, may be considered as having received a special indorsement by the highest authority of his Church. It is certainly one of those which is most popular and influential in forming the minds of the Italian clergy, and used, at least, to be most frequently seen on those bookshelves which hang at the bedside of a young seminarist. We believe, therefore, that in quoting it we are appealing to an authority to which no earnest Romanist can demur.

There is some difficulty in saying anything shortly on this subject. If we quote the succinct statement of a theologian, we are told that it must be interpreted by the popular teaching of the Church—if we appeal to a popular practice, we are told that it must be understood in the sense in which it is explained, or explained away, by the doctors of the Church. Then there are the usual charges of taking literally what is said rhetorically—of citing passages unexplained by their context, or of quoting as characteristic what is in fact exceptional—charges which it is hardly possible for a writer to forestall, without burying himself

in the mass of his own quotations and comments. Liguori, however, is in some of these respects a convenient referee. He is a theologian—but he is writing a book evidently for popular use. He adopts broadly the broad principles of preceding theologians. ‘Nunquam peribit qui genitrici Virgini devotus sedulusque extiterit.’ ‘*Quantumcunque quis fuerit peccator, si Mariæ devotus extiterit, nunquam in æternum peribit.*’ ‘Fieri non potest ut pereat qui Mariæ sedulus et humilis cultor extiterit.’ ‘It is the sentiment of many theologians, and specially of S. Thomas, that for many persons who have even died in mortal sin, the divine mother has obtained from God the suspension of their sentence and their return to life to perform penance. And of this many examples are recorded by grave authors.’ (Vol. i. pp. 253, 256, 257.) And he particularly protests against those who grudge to expressions of this class their full force, or attempt to mitigate or explain them away. (P. 165.) We may fairly, therefore, take in their natural and obvious meaning the following stories, by which he attempts to illustrate the power of a mere recitation of a prayer to the Virgin, used by persons of infamous life, disjoined from all desire or intention of holiness or repentance, and not always amounting even to that ‘humble and sedulous’ devotion which is extolled in the passages quoted from Ignatius and Blossius. We do not quote these stories for the purpose of pointing out the real irreverence of imposing on the holy Virgin (we almost shrink from writing the words) the character of a weak woman, captivated by mere external and personal attentions—that very lip-service which is denounced in Scripture as most hateful to God: we quote them to illustrate the supernatural power which is ascribed to a mere formality, justly characterised by Liguori himself as a ‘wretched devotion’—‘questa misera divozione.’ They show that the virtue which Budhists attribute to a mere abstract apprehension of truth, Roman Catholics are equally ready to discover in the most empty devotion to the fashionable object of worship.

‘The same father found a sinner in the hospital, who had not confessed for fifty-five years, and had only performed this wretched act of devotion—that is, that when he saw an image of Mary, he saluted it, and prayed that she would not cause him to die in mortal sin; and then he told how he had broken his sword in a quarrel with his enemy; and had then turned to the Madonna and said to her, “Alas! now I shall be killed, and damned. Mother of sinners! help me.” And in saying this, he found himself, without knowing how, transported to a safe place. And having made a general confession, he died full of confidence,’ (*se ne morì pieno di confidenza*).—*Glorie di Maria*, vol. i. p. 241.

‘In the year 1604 there were in a city of Flanders two young students, who, instead of attending to their studies, gave themselves up wholly to debauchery and evil living. One night, when they had been in the house of a bad woman, after some time one of them, named Richard, returned home, the other remained. While Richard was undressing to go to bed,

he remembered that he had not that day recited any Ave Marias to the Blessed Virgin, as he was accustomed to do. Being heavy with sleep, it annoyed him, nevertheless he exerted himself and recited them, though without devotion and half asleep (*mezzo dormendo*). Then he lay down, and in his first sleep, he heard a loud knock at the door, and immediately afterwards, without the door being opened, he saw his companion before him all defiled and horrible. "Who art thou?" he said. "Do you not know me?" answered the other. "But how thou art changed, thou appearest to be a demon." "Unhappy me!" exclaimed the wretch, "I am damned." "And how?" "Know," he said, "that when I left that infamous house, a demon came and strangled me. My body lies in the street; my soul is in hell. Know," he then added, "that the same punishment awaited thee, but the Blessed Virgin, on account of that little homage of the Ave Marias, delivered thee from it. Happy, if thou knowest how to avail thyself of this warning, which the mother of God sends to thee through me!" So saying, the damned man opened his cloak, showed him the flames and serpents which tormented him, and disappeared. Then the youth, bursting into a flood of tears, threw himself with his face on the ground to thank his deliverer, Mary; and while he was thinking about changing his life, he heard the matin bell ring in the Franciscan monastery. Then he said, "Here God calls me to do penance." He went that same hour to the convent to entreat the fathers to receive him. They hesitated, as knowing his evil life, but he told them the whole story, weeping bitterly; and two fathers going to that street, found in truth the body of his companion as black as a coal; and they received him. Richard thenceforth led an exemplary life. He afterwards went to India to preach the faith; thence to Japan, and there finally had the lot and the grace to die a martyr for Jesus Christ, being burnt alive.—*Ibid.* Pp. 259—261.

'It is related by P. Carolus Bovius, that at Domans, in France, there was a man who, having a wife, held sinful intercourse with another woman. The wife not being able to endure this, did nothing but pray for punishments from God for them, and especially one day she went to an altar of the Blessed Virgin, which was in a certain church, to seek for justice upon the woman who had taken from her her husband. And that other sinner went every day to recite an Ave Maria to the same image. One night the divine Mother appeared in a dream to the aforesaid wife, who seeing her, began at once the old cry:—"Justice, Mother of God, justice." But the Madonna answered, "Justice? Dost thou seek justice from me? Go seek some other who will give it thee, I cannot do it for thee. Know (she then added) that this sinner every day recites a salutation to me which, if it be recited to me by any person, I cannot permit that they should suffer or be punished for their sins." When day dawned, the wife went to hear mass in the same Church of the Madonna, and as she left it, she met her husband's mistress, and began to abuse her, saying that she was a sorceress, and by her sorceries had even bewitched the Holy Virgin. "Silence," said the people, "what are you saying?" "Why should I be silent?" she answered, "what I say is truer than truth itself. This night the Madonna appeared to me, and when I sought justice from her, she answered that she could not give it because of a prayer which that wretch recites to her every day." They then asked the other what prayer it was that she recited to the Mother of God. She answered that it was the Ave Maria. But when she heard that because of this wretched devotion the Blessed Virgin had shown her so much mercy, she went at once to throw herself before the holy image, and there in the presence of all, asking pardon for her scandalous life, vowed perpetual continence. And having become a nun, and having built for herself a little room close to the church, she shut herself up in it, and there persevered till death in continual penitence.—*Ibid.* p. 297.

The circumstance that all these stories end with a repentance, does not interfere with their evident moral, which is this—not, indeed, that sinners can be saved without repentance, but that if they recite a proper number of Ave Marias, they *need not trouble themselves for the present about* repentance; as in that case the Virgin Mary will not suffer them to be chastised for their sins, or cut off in them—or if cut off, will procure a suspension of the divine law, to save them from the consequences of being so cut off. The object of most Christian teachers is to persuade sinners that ‘now is the accepted time,’—that they cannot with safety defer for a moment the painful effort of conversion. But these stories, if true, would show that a man might with very tolerable safety persevere in sin if he is only punctual in paying his devotions to the Virgin Mary. It is true that Liguori, who was doubtless a good man, earnestly deprecates this mode of applying his principles, somewhat as a respectable Antinomian beseeches his congregation to be moral in spite of the encouragement which *his* Gospel holds out to vice. It would be as mad, he argues, to risk dying in mortal sin in hope that Mary would deliver us from hell, as to throw ourselves into a pit because Mary has saved some from death who have done so. But a principle does not change its nature, because we are entreated not to draw from it its natural conclusion. And the principle resulting from all, and broadly announced in the last of these stories, appears to us to rank with the most pernicious of those which Buddhism has to show. It is worse than the story of Bindumati, so far as the salvation of human souls is a graver subject than the flux or reflux of a river.

But it is time to proceed to the third part of this subject—the actual working and religious polity of Buddhism. And here we almost lose sight of Mr. Spence Hardy, and return to our more lively friend M. Huc and the great Tartaro-Chinese empire. Some inconsistencies may be found between the doctrines of Ceylon and the facts of Tartary. But we think it probable that a truer idea will be given by taking M. Huc’s account of the facts which he records, than by a necessarily conjectural attempt to harmonize the two.

Tartary is an immense hierarchy, in which the Lamas or priests compose, according to M. Huc, at least one third of the population. In most families the eldest son alone remains a ‘black man;’ the others become Lamas. To that state they are devoted in the first instance by their parents, but they gradually attach themselves to it, and contract universally ‘a certain religious exaltation’ and sense of authority, by which our missionaries appear to have been much impressed.

The obligations of a priest have been already described in our

quotations from Mr. Spence Hardy; but that gentleman appears to treat them rather as a matter of literature than as a matter of fact. And so, we presume, they are to be considered in Ceylon. From M. Huc we should have gathered that Lamas are obliged to a stricter performance of the moral law than the rest of the community; and, moreover, to wear a certain dress, to keep certain ceremonial observances, to abstain from taking animal life in any form, and to maintain the rule of celibacy. The last rule is evidently the trial of the system. Any breach of it by a person holding the priestly character, (like theft, murder, or a false profession of having attained the rahatship,) entails a permanent exclusion from the priesthood. But it is most important to add that any priest may, on 'confession of his weakness,' throw off for a time the character and obligations of a priest, and be afterwards re-admitted to his order. (*East. Mon.* pp. 8, 9.) It is obvious that by such a relaxation the rule itself might be almost entirely neutralized. The practice, however, seems to differ in different places. In Ceylon it is very rare for a priest to put off his habit. In Siam it is very common. We should gather from M. Huc, that in Tartary it was not sufficiently frequent to invalidate the general rule. We hear, indeed, in one instance, of a revolt by a knot of married Lamas, but the nascent reformation was soon put down, and we are not told of priestly libertinage, either in their ordinary yellow or their exceptional black coats.

M. Huc divides the Lamas into three classes. The first is of a common-place kind. It is composed of men who live in their families, and are only distinguished from laymen by their yellow dress, and their personal fulfilment (such as it may be) of the priestly obligations. They serve to educate the young at home, and by their presence to keep alive throughout the country that deep attachment to their religion, and reverence for holy men and things which are characteristic of the Tartar.

The second is a more singular class—we must give M. Huc's description of them. They are called the wandering, or vagabond Lamas.

'They live like birds of passage, settling themselves nowhere; ever driven onward by some secret restlessness or vague hatred of repose. They wander only for the sake of wandering—to get over the ground—to change their place; they go from Lamaserie to Lamaserie, and stop, on their road, in all the tents that they come across, sure that Tartar hospitality will never fail them. They enter without ceremony, and sit down beside the hearth; tea is warmed for them, and as they drink, they recount with pride the number of countries they have traversed. If the fancy takes them to pass the night in the tent, they stretch themselves in a corner and sleep soundly till the morrow. In the morning, before starting again on their wanderings, they stand an instant in front of the tent, looking vaguely at the clouds and the tops of the mountains, turning their heads on one side and the other, as if

to take counsel with the winds. At last they start, always without an end, only guided by the paths which they see by chance before them. They go on with their heads bent forward, their eyes on the ground, a long stick in their hands, and a knapsack of sheep-skin on their backs. When they are tired, they rest at the foot of a rock, the top of a mountain, the bottom of a ravine, wherever their inconstant fancy drives them. Often in their journey they meet only the desert, and then, wherever night overtakes them, they sleep beneath the sky; the cover, as they say, of that immense tent which men call the world.

'These wandering Lamas visit all the countries accessible to them; China, Mantchourie, the Khalkas, the different kingdoms of southern Mongolia, Ouriang-hai, Koukon-Noor, the north and south of the Celestial Mountains, Thibet, India, and sometimes even Turkey. There is no river which they have not crossed, nor mountain which they have not climbed, nor Grand Lama before whom they have not prostrated themselves, nor people among whom they have not dwelt, and whose manners, customs, and tongue they have not learnt. In all their wanderings, the danger of straying from the road and losing themselves in the desert does not exist for them. As they travel without object, the places they arrive at are always those they wish to go to. The legend of the Wandering Jew seems exactly realized in these Lamas. They seem under the influence of a secret power which drives them restlessly from place to place. One might believe that God had mingled with their blood some of that motive power by which the worlds are driven unceasingly along their orbits.'—Vol. i. pp. 189—192.

The third, and by far the most important class of Lamas, are those who live in Lamaseries, *wiharas* as they would be called in Ceylon, or as we will at once venture to call them, convents. In Tartary these establishments are numerous and very large. The Convent of the Thousand Lamas contains four times what its name implies—that of Koun-boum the same number, those in the Blue City twenty thousand, and that of the Great Kouren (of which hereafter) with the dependencies in its immediate neighbourhood, contains no less than thirty thousand members. But before proceeding to these, we must shortly notice the somewhat distinct class of Contemplative Lamas—a class of ascetics which Mr. Spence Hardy supposes to be extinct, but which M. Huc found not uncommon in Tartary and Thibet. We have seen that the father of the chief, Proul Tamba, was the pupil of one such personage; some more were visited by our travellers on the top of a precipitous mountain above the convent of Tchogorten. One was inaccessible, communicating with the world below only by a bag, rope, and pulley. It is stated that when the convent was plundered by brigands, the ascetics were spared. The fact, however, can scarcely be considered as very significant, for a robber must have been much in want of professional amusement, who could find any in clambering up a perpendicular precipice to plunder a Contemplative Lama. M. Huc is not unapt to indulge in a Protestant scoff at the uninstructed credulity of the Tartars, with whom, he contemptuously says, '*la sublimité d'une doctrine est en raison directe de*

son obscurité et son impenetrabilité,' and the anchorites are treated in somewhat the same tone.

'Nous avons eu des rapports assez fréquents avec ces Lamas contemplatifs, mais nous n'avons jamais pu savoir au juste ce qu'ils contemplaient là-haut, du fond de leur niche. Ils étaient eux-mêmes très incapables de s'en rendre un compte bien exact; ils avaient embrassé, nous disaient-ils, ce genre de vie, parce qu'ils avaient lu dans leur livres, que des Lamas d'une grande sainteté avaient vécu de la sorte. Au résumé, ils étaient assez bonnes gens; leur naturel était simple, paisible, et nullement farouche; ils passaient le temps à prier, et quand ils en étaient fatigués, ils trouvaient dans le sommeil un honnête délassement.'—*Huc*, vol. ii. p. 146.

With this short notice of a very peculiar class, we may now proceed to our account of the Lamanesque convents,—whether viewed as centres of political power, or of religious knowledge, of moral discipline, or of growth in art or science, beyond comparison the most remarkable institutions in Tartary. We shall, therefore, select a few passages to illustrate the growth of these powerful establishments, their external aspect, the characters of those who compose them, their religious ceremonies, their discipline and constitution. Our extracts will be principally taken from M. Huc's record of three months which he spent at the famous convent of Koun-boum.

The rise of Tartar convents is due, as in Europe, to the energy and reputation of individuals. The parallel, indeed, is sufficiently close to be worth observing. We borrow from Mr. Spence Hardy, Lingard's account of the rise of early European monasteries:—

'Wherever (at the commencement of monachism) there dwelt a monk of superior reputation for sanctity, the desire of profiting by his advice and example induced others to fix their habitations in his neighbourhood; he became their *abbas*, or spiritual father, they his voluntary subjects; and the group of separate cells which they formed around him was known to others by the name of his monastery, (so that the word which originally signified the single mansion of one solitary, now denoted a collection of such mansions.) To obtain admission into their societies no other qualification was required in the postulant than a spirit of penitence and a desire of Christian perfection. As long as this spirit continued to animate his conduct, he was exercised in the several duties of the monastic profession: if he repented of his choice, the road was open, and he was at liberty to depart. . . . It was not till a much later period, and after the decline of the original fervour, that irrevocable vows were enjoined by the policy of subsequent legislators.'—*Lingard*, (cited in *Eastern Monachism*, pp. 55, 56.)

So, *mutatis mutandis*, M. Huc of the Eastern convents:—

'Sometimes,' [he says, describing the living Budhas or Chabérons of Tartary.] 'they begin their course modestly in a little temple, surrounded only by a few disciples. Gradually their fame increases in the neighbourhood, and the little Lamaserie becomes soon an object of pilgrimages and devotion. The neighbouring Lamas, speculating on its reputation, fasten upon it their little cells; the Lamaserie extends itself year by year, and at last becomes famous in the country.'—*Huc*, vol. i. p. 278.

Before long the growing dignity of the saint requires the erection of a more sumptuous temple, and mendicants with proper religious credentials sally forth to collect the requisite funds from every part of Tartary. The mendicant is a peculiar character. He stops his horse (for no Tartar ever travels on foot) at the door of every tent which he reaches, and sounds three blasts on his sea-shell. The inmate comes forth and drops his offering in kind into the Lama's bag; much as Italian travellers may have seen a log or a cabbage dropped into the pannier of a Capuchin's ass. But the building of a temple calls for, and is met by, a more eager and unfailing profuseness. 'So simple and frugal in their dress and diet, the generosity, or rather prodigality, of these people is astonishing, when the expenses of religion and maintenance of religious worship are in question.' Every one gives,—the rich gold and silver, horses and camels,—the poor, butter, furs, or the cordage of the country. Immense sums are soon collected, and 'then in these sterile wastes edifices spring up, as if by enchantment, which for grandeur and costliness would tax the resources of the most wealthy potentates. It was, doubtless, this eager co-operation of all the faithful which raised in Europe those gigantic cathedrals which are a standing reproach to the selfishness and indifference of our own times.'

No doubt. And the aspect of an imposing Buddhist Lamaserie amidst the wilds of Tartary, must curiously represent the contrast between a massive conventual structure of the eleventh century, and the rude cottages and cultivations of our Frank or Saxon ancestors. The great temple usually rises, or rather lies, in the middle of a Lamanesque village—a cluster of white huts varied by a profusion of irregular towers and heavy pedestals surmounted by attenuated pyramids. The temple appears generally to be a striking but grotesque medley of shapeless canopies, interminable flights of steps, and colonnades supported by twisted columns. The situation is generally as well chosen as in Europe. Here is M. Huc's picturesque description of the monastery of Koun-boum.

'Its position is truly enchanting. Imagine a wide and deep ravine running up into a mountain and broken by large trees which are always peopled by crows, magpies, and yellow-beaked ravens. The amphitheatre formed by the sides of the ravine and the face of the hill is covered by the white dwellings of the Lamas, all of different sizes, all enclosed by a wall and crowned by little belvederes. Among these humble dwellings, only rich in their cleanliness and whiteness, arise here and there the gilded roofs of numerous Buddhist temples, sparkling with a thousand colours, and surrounded by elegant colonnades. The houses of the superiors are distinguished by banners which float above little hexagon towers. On every side you see mystical sentences written in large Thibetan letters, sometimes red and sometimes black; they are above all the doors, on the stones, on scraps

of cloth hoisted like flags on the little masts which stand on the terraced roofs of the houses. At almost every step you meet little sugar-loaf shaped niches, in which incense, sweet smelling wood, and cypress leaves are burnt. What is most striking, however, is to see a whole people of Lamas clothed in red, with yellow mitres on their heads, threading the numerous streets of the monastery. Their gait is usually grave; silence is not prescribed, yet they speak little, and always in a low voice. It is only at the hours of public worship, or when the schools meet or break up, that many of them are abroad. During the rest of the day the Lamas keep their cells pretty closely; only some are to be seen descending by winding paths to the bottom of the ravine, and climbing up again with difficulty with a long barrel of water on their backs. You meet also some strangers, who have come to worship, or to visit Lamas of their acquaintance.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 93—95.

The missionaries' account of their arrival at this spot is an almost touching record of the first impression produced upon them by this imposing establishment.

'When we were about a *li* distance from the monastery, we met four Lamas, friends of Sandara, who had come to meet us. Their religious dress, the red scarf in which they were wrapped, their yellow cap, in the shape of a mitre, their modesty, their grave words and low voices made a singular impression upon us; and brought to us as it were an odour of religious and conventual life. It was past nine in the evening when we reached the first dwellings of the monastery. That the deep silence which reigned around might not be broken, the Lamas made our driver stop, and filled with straw the little bells which hung to the horses' collars. We then proceeded slowly, and without speaking a single word, through the still and deserted streets of this great Lamanesque city. The moon was already set, but the sky was so clear, and the stars so brilliant, that we could easily discern the little houses of the Lamas scattered on the sides of the mountain, and the grandiose and fantastic shapes of the Buddhist temples which stood forth against the sky, like gigantic phantoms. What most struck us was the solemn and majestic silence which reigned in all parts of the monastery, only broken by the irregular barkings of some dogs half asleep, and by the dull and melancholy sound of a sea-shell, which marked at proper intervals the watches of the night; you might fancy you heard the gloomy song of the osprey. At last we reached Sandara's small house.'—*Ibid.* pp. 84, 85.

On their arrival they were overwhelmed with kindness. They were first taken to call in form upon their future landlord.

'Le Lama nous fit asseoir sur un tapis, nous offrit une tasse de thé au lait, et nous dit en langue Mongole, qu'il était heureux que des étrangers venus de si loin—que des Lamas du ciel d'occident eussent daigné jeter leurs regards sur sa chétive habitation . . . S'il eût compris le Français, c'eût été le cas de répondre: Monsieur, il n'y a pas de quoi . . . Mais comme il fallait parler Mongol, nous lui dîmes qu'en effet nous étions de bien loin, que cependant on retrouvait, en quelque sorte, sa patrie, quand on avait le bonheur de rencontrer une hospitalité comme la sienne . . . Après avoir pris une tasse de thé, et causé un instant de la France, de Rome, du Pape et des Cardinaux, (!) nous nous levâmes pour aller visiter la demeure qui nous était destinée.'—*Ibid.* pp. 88, 89.

Very comfortable they found it, and they immediately took possession, aided by all the neighbours. Everybody took

pleasure in carrying their baggage, in sweeping their rooms, in lighting their fires and arranging the stables for their cattle. The whole concluded as etiquette required, by a feast from the landlord.

‘How powerful is religion over the human heart! even when it is false and wanders ever so far from its true object. What a contrast between these Lamas, so generous, so hospitable, so brotherly towards strangers, and the Chinese—that nation of shopkeepers, with their cold and money-loving hearts, who sell to the traveller even a glass of cold water. The warmth of our reception at the lamaserie of Koun-boum carried back our recollections to those convents raised by the hospitality of our religious ancestors, which were in other times so many hostelrys where the traveller and the poor man was sure to find refreshment for his body, and consolation for his soul.—*Ibid.* p. 89.

The short sketches we have of the neighbours among whom they were now placed, are various and life-like. Opposite is the lean, withered, and tottering old Akayé, who had made a good fortune in the management of the convent, but had spent it all in works of charity and loans which had never been repaid. He could neither read nor write, but had always his rosary in his hand, and was always muttering in his cell some forms of prayer. ‘The man had an excellent heart, but nobody took much notice of him—he was old and ruined.’ Next to him lives a miserly Chinese Lama, with a great country reputation, but who had found his level at Koun-boum, with his well-natured pickle of a pupil, always eating too much of his master’s butter, wasting his candle, and mimicking the big stutrer who lived over the way, a shy, well-meaning creature, who wanted to be at once a good Christian and a good Buddhist, ‘et dont la lourde et épaisse figure l’accusait de faire dans son ‘étroit réduit, une assez forte consommation de beurre. Nous ‘ne pouvions jamais le voir mettre le nez à la porte de sa case ‘sans songer à ce rat de La Fontaine qui, par devotion, s’était ‘retiré dans un fromage de Hollande.’ And last, not least, should be noticed the adroit, active, adventurous, proud, overbearing charlatan, Sandara—their tutor and tormentor, during their stay at the convent—and a unique specimen, as far as they could see, of a Lama who disbelieved his creed. These individual specimens illustrate the variety of character which will be found under the most tranquil and monotonous exterior; but M. Hue furnishes us with a more general estimate of the class. It will have been seen that the characteristic demeanour of the Lama is kind, grave, and modest. Nor probably is this mere surface kindness. Gravity is an element of their character. But so are volatility and violence, which burst forth on occasions with an oriental inconsistency. They reflect to the full the thoughtless and improvident character of their nation. If

they make money by their professions, some give it away in charity, like Akayé; some hoard it, like the miserly Chinoise; but the majority throw it away with little loss of time in gauds and finery. Some, again, are mere charlatans and adventurers, (of whom more fully hereafter,) and the brethren appear by no means incapable of resorting to fisticuffs for the settlement of internal disputes, nor, with all their superstitious regard for animal life, of rising in arms when their property is carried away by brigands, or one of their ecclesiastical dignitaries is suspected to have been poisoned, or known to have been arrested, by the Chinese. But with all this, they are, as a mass, in earnest about their religion. Among the many Lamas of Koun-boum, who visited the Missionaries in crowds every day, and always talked about religion, 'we found not one,' says M. Huc, 'of the sceptical cast of Sandara; all appeared to us sincerely religious, and full of good faith.' But, what is very curious, they appear with this to have united a warm and friendly curiosity respecting Christianity. 'Many of them,' says M. Huc, 'attached a high importance to the knowledge 'and study of the truth; they often came to pray for instruction in our holy religion.' We have had occasion to remark this at Lassa. Devotedly—perhaps fanatically—attached to his own religion, the Lama is singularly tolerant of others. The irreligious Chinese, Buddhist in name, but in fact a mere unbeliever, is the severe and jealous persecutor; the devout Tartar or Thibetan is the generous and open-hearted friend of the Christian. 'Oh! la sainte doctrine.' 'Oh! les saintes règles de l'Occident!' are their exclamations when they are first informed of the elementary truths and practices of Christianity.

But the circumstances under which the missionaries left Koun-boum exhibit more remarkably than any general statement the mixture of correct regularity with courteous and tolerant hospitality which prevailed in the convent. The missionaries wore habitually the yellow robe, which is the secular or every-day dress of the Lama. But it was absolutely required by the rules of Koun-boum, that all residents should wear the red dress of ceremony. For more than three months our Missionaries were allowed to infringe this rule. At last, however, the authorities felt obliged to remonstrate, and our friends were requested to conform. They replied that, not being Buddhists, they could not conscientiously adopt the sacred, or ceremonial dress of Buddhism; but that, if the rule were inflexible, they were ready to depart. The authorities, after some delay, and with full knowledge of the Missionaries' teaching, replied that the rule could no longer be dispensed with, 'qu'on était peiné que notre sublime et sainte religion ne nous permît pas de

nous y conformer,' and, therefore, that they must leave the monastery; but that comfortable quarters, with full liberty to dress as they pleased, would be provided for them at the subsidiary convent of Tchogortan—the 'maison de campagne' of the medical faculty. Thither they were accordingly conducted with the greatest kindness, and there they were housed with such comforts as the case admitted of, until they found it convenient to proceed on their travels.

But to proceed with our description of the place and its practices. The Lamas monopolize all the knowledge and science that are to be found in Tartary. More especially are they the sculptors, painters, and architects of the country; and their whole powers are exhausted on the adornment of their temples. The exterior of these we have already described. Within, images abound—not, as some Budhists maintain, as being themselves divine, but as mementos of divinity. The sculpture of the Lamas, like that of our mediæval artists, is better than their painting. The idols are accordingly well formed, and the temple is covered with a profusion of every sort of carving, executed with astonishing truth and spirit. In one of their exhibitions—the Feast of Flowers—at which our travellers were present, every kind of human and animal life was modelled, strange to say, in butter, not only with surprising accuracy, but with considerable ease and even grandeur. The face of Budha, in particular, is described as 'full of nobleness and majesty.' The paintings are inferior; but M. Hue's description of them would remind us, in many respects, of early Christian art. 'The grotesque,' he says, 'predominates, and the personages, except the Budhas, have usually a monstrous and diabolical appearance. The dresses seem never to have been made for the persons who are bundled up in them. You would say that the limbs which are hidden by the drapery are broken and dislocated.' Yet even paintings are to be found which astonished the French Missionaries, 'not only by the purity and grace of their design, but by their rich colouring, and the expression of their faces.'

On a level with the principal altar is the throne of the living Budha whom most important monasteries have for their Grand Lama. Here is a description of his costume:—

'In the person of the Grand Lama there was little to remark. Not so in his costume, which was point for point that of our bishops. He wore on his head a yellow mitre, in his right hand was a long rod in the shape of a crosier, and on his shoulders a violet silk cloak fastened over the chest by a clasp, and in every particular resembling a cope.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 101.

The other Lamas have their set places. The blowing of a shell collects them for religious worship, which commences on the ringing of a bell. Each Lama first murmurs a low prayer;

a short silence succeeds, and then on the second ringing of a bell begins an antiphonal psalm-singing—‘une psalmodie à deux chœurs sur un ton grave et mélodieux,’ for which it seems the short versicles which compose the Thibetan prayers are peculiarly adapted. Thibetan, we say, for the worship is everywhere conducted in the language of their religious metropolis. But lest this imposing worship should be without an infusion of characteristic extravagance, it is interrupted at fixed intervals by a kind of *charivari* of bells, cymbals, drums, shells, trumpets, whistles, &c., during which ‘chaque musicien joue son instrument avec une espèce de furie—c’est à qui produira le plus de bruit et le plus de désordre.’

In point of discipline, there are two great differences between the laws of a Lamaserie and of a Christian monastery;—first, that every one is apparently at liberty to leave a Lamaserie when he pleases, and—unless expelled for any misdemeanour—return to it; and next, that there is no strict community of property. Offerings are made, and the surrounding pastures belong to the convent; but every Lama may make and keep property obtained by the exercise of his profession, or otherwise. The difference, therefore, between rich and poor, which in Europe existed only between convent and convent, or between abbot and brethren,¹ exists in Tartary between all the different members of the community.

If, however, the Lamas are not obliged to remain in the convent, they are obliged, while they do remain, to conform to its rules by certain constable Lamas, who circulate, in dresses of black and grey, somewhat like university proctors, through the lecture rooms by day and the streets by night, and enforce a severe and watchful discipline by means of a powerful whip, (a method now antiquated in our universities,) a stout bar of iron, and, in extreme cases, the brand. As an university, the convent too has its faculties; they are four: 1. Mysticism and hagiography; 2. Religious ceremonial; 3. Medicine; 4. Prayer. It has also its disputations, which reminded M. Hue of the mediæval schools in their omnigenous minuteness. The conqueror is rewarded by the privilege of riding his opponent pic-a-back round the convent. Their friend Sandara obtained this distinction in a controversy which had reference apparently to a chicken’s gizzard. In the mode of instruction pursued, the only noticeable feature is a remarkably liberal use of the stick, which the pupils themselves appear to consider, not so much an instrument of punishment, as an indispensable method of fixing prayers in the memory.

¹ Vide Joscelin de Brakelond *passim*.

The constitution of these monasteries is a matter not only of religious but of political importance. In Tartary it is quasi-monarchical, not unlike that of Kennaquhair. The Grand Lama, or living Budha, usually a Thibetan, regulates the religious ceremonial, and like a Lucretian deity receives the adoration of the faithful. But the Mongol superior, a kind of *maire du Palais*, a native, and usually of royal extraction, is charged with the practical administration, the order and police of the convent, and, in the phrase of M. Huc, is allowed to govern, while the other is content to reign.

The election of a new Grand Lama—the centre, as it were, of the religious life of the community—is one of the most curious and characteristic practices related by M. Huc. When a Grand Lama dies,—or, in their phrase, departs,—the monastery, though anxious and excited, is not in mourning. They know that the spirit has merely migrated into another human form, and that their business is to find him out. With this view they fast, they pray, they watch omens, and consult diviners. A rainbow is his principal sign, and by its date, its position, the clearness of its colours, and the mode of its disappearance, the soothsayer is able to tell them where their idol is to be found. Sometimes, however, the saint or divinity saves them this trouble.

‘As soon as he has performed his metamorphosis in Thibet, and before an ordinary infant could pronounce a word, he reveals himself. “It is I,” he says in a tone of authority, “It is I, who am the Grand Lama—the living Budha of such a temple; let them conduct me to my old Lamaserie; I am its immortal head.” The prodigious infant, having thus spoken, they hasten to inform the Lamas of the indicated *soumè* that their Chaberon is born in such and such a place, and they summon them, on his authority, to come and invite him thither.’—*Ibid*, vol. i. p. 280.

Forthwith the Tartars are in movement,—kings, princes, mandarins and people pour forth to convoy the young Lama, who makes a point, it seems, of effecting his new birth in some remote and almost inaccessible country. Sometimes they are plundered; sometimes they perish from cold; sometimes they are driven back to their own country; but some of them at last succeed in appearing before the miraculous child.

‘The young Chaberon, however, is not worshipped and proclaimed Grand Lama without a preliminary examination. A solemn assembly is held, at which the living Budha is publicly and minutely catechised; they ask him the name and particulars of the monastery of which he claims the presidency; they question him upon the habits of the dead Lama, and upon the circumstances of his death. Then they put before him different books of prayer, pieces of furniture, tea-pots, cups, &c. He must point out among all these, whatever belonged to him in his former life. Usually this child, at most but five or six years old, is victorious in all these trials. He answers exactly all the questions put to him, and gives, without em-

barrassment, the inventory of his goods. "Here," says he, "are the books of prayer I have been accustomed to use. Here is the varnished saucer, in which I used to have my tea," and so on. Doubtless, the Mongols are often duped by those who are interested in making a Grand Lama out of this child. We think, however, that on both sides, all this is often done in good faith. From the testimony which we took care to obtain from trustworthy persons, it seems certain that all that is said of the Chabérons cannot be disposed of as if it were illusion and trick. A merely human philosophy would doubtless reject such facts, or treat them, without hesitation, as Lamanesque imposture. For us, Catholic Missionaries, we think that the father of lies, who formerly deceived our first parents in paradise, continues his system of falsehood. He who had the power to support Simon Magus in the air, can well at this time speak to men by means of a child, in order to keep up the faith of his worshippers.

'The title of the living Budha being established, he is led in triumph to the *soumé* of which he is again to become the Grand Lama. Along his road all is astir; the Tartars come in crowds to prostrate themselves in his path, and to present their offerings. As soon as he arrives in the Lamaserie, he is placed upon the altar; and then, kings, princes, mandarins, lamas, all the Tartars, from the richest to the poorest, come to bend before this child, whom they have sought with such pains in the depths of Thibet, and whose demoniacal possession excites universal deference, wonder, and enthusiasm.—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 281—283.

Two of these false divinities our travellers saw—one a poor boy who seemed oppressed by a sense of his imposture, the other a restless good-natured kind of man, who condescended to visit them in their room at a Tartar hotel, rather to the scandal of his attendants.

'A breviary, which lay beside us, immediately fixed his attention. He asked if he might examine it. Being answered in the affirmative, he took it in his hands, admired the binding and gilt edges, opened it, and turned over the leaves—then shut it, and lifted it with solemnity to his forehead, saying, "It is your prayer-book, we should always honour and respect prayers." Then, he added, "Your religion and ours are so," and so saying, he placed against each other the tips of his forefingers. "Yes," we replied, "our creeds are hostile; we do not disguise that the object of all our travels and labours is to substitute our prayers for those which your monasteries use." "I know it," he said with a smile, "I have long known it." Then he again took the breviary, and asked us to explain the numerous engravings which it contained. Nothing that we said seemed to astonish him,—only, when we had explained the picture of the Crucifixion, he shook his head with an expression of pity, and joined his hands, and lifted them to his forehead. Having gone through all the engravings, he took the breviary from our hands, and again touched his head with it. Then he arose, and saluting us courteously, left the room.—*Ibid.* vol. ii., pp. 39, 40.

They returned the visit, and were received by the Chaberon with friendliness. The fact was, he seemed full of curiosity, and very glad to see them. His words and manner, they say, were full of affability—there was in his face '*une bonhommie onnante*,' yet there was a certain strangeness of expression which they could not get over.

'We imagined that we saw in his eyes something of the infernal and diabolical. This peculiarity apart, which arose perhaps from certain prepossessions of our own, we should have found him extremely amiable.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 42.

As many of these Grand Lamas are (like those in Thibet) princes as well as priests, it may be imagined that they have considerable capacities for making themselves troublesome. But of all in Tartary, far the most formidable appears to be the Guison Tamba. This potentate presides over the monastery of the Great Kouren, containing in itself, and its immediate dependencies, no less than 30,000 Lamas, and is at once obeyed and worshipped throughout the large tracts inhabited by the Khalkas, the countrymen of the great Genghis Khan, and apparently the most warlike (at least in aspiration) of the Tartars. Among them the Guison Tamba is *par excellence* 'the saint.' If you ask a Khalka his country, 'I am a disciple,' he says with pride, 'of the holy Kouren.' He depends, he will tell you, on the Guison Tamba alone, 'and not on the *black man* who sits on the throne of Pekin.' Such a personage is of course an object of considerable jealousy to the rulers of China. He is always watched, and sometimes poisoned. Once in the centre of his own dominions he was summarily put to death for omitting to rise in presence of the great emperor Khang-hi; but it nearly cost the lives of the monarch and his suite. By dint, however, of courage and adroitness, they escaped, and the emperor lost no time in providing against a danger which had so nearly destroyed him. His precautions were characteristic. His enemy was by hypothesis indestructible. By cutting off the man's head he had but operated a transmigration, for a fresh Guison Tamba was already in the field. To dethrone him was more than the most bold and sagacious of Chinese emperors could venture on, and his sovereignty was accordingly recognised over the Great Kouren. But in so doing the emperor took a course not unknown to European potentates. He brought the supreme Pontiff to bear upon the enemy, and in order to break the connexion between Khalka nationality and its representative, decreed, somewhat whimsically, with the concurrence of the Talé-Lama, that after every death the Guison-Tamba should be under an obligation to transmigrate into Thibet. The order has been scrupulously obeyed. But the Khalka Lamas wear to this day a black stripe on their collars, in memory of the Chinese sacrilege. And the saint, it is said, is always caught young, and carefully imbued in the course of his education with the spirit of independence, and an angry recollection of the outrage inflicted upon him in his former life by the *black man* of Pekin.

This is but a specimen of the dangers to which the Chinese Empire is exposed from the 'associated priesthood.' It is provided for partly, as we have said, by diplomacy at head quarters, where, as we have seen, the Chinese influence is rapidly becoming preponderant; but partly also by endeavouring to attach the Lamas to the existing state of things by grants of privileges and money. This policy is supposed to have the double effect of attaching the ruling class to the government, and of arresting the growth of a dangerous population by increasing the unmarried part of it. But palliatives of this kind at last lose their effect, and the book before us certainly suggests the expectation that the day will come, expected alike by Tartar and Thibetan—and even, it would seem, by the Chinese themselves, when a religious leader of power and ambition will avail himself of the simple enthusiasm of Tartary, or the martial and independent fanaticism of Thibet, or of both, to annihilate the system of cunning contrivance by which the authority of Pekin is now sustained, and either to appropriate or break to pieces the great Chinese Empire. In the former contingency we might probably see a repetition of the history of the Mantchous—another evidence that the intelligence and enterprise of a nation, even when directed to mere money-getting civilization, is more than able to compensate for the inefficiency of their rulers. From the second, results might follow most important to the prospects of Christianity in those parts which were emancipated from the pinching dominion of China.

Several points remain which we could wish to have noticed: the Tartar love for religious pilgrimages—a singularly close reproduction of mediæval Europe,—the legends of saints who have been suspended in or wafted through the air by force of their devotion—the formula¹ of the *mani*—the expectations (already alluded

¹ The words of this formula are 'Om, mani, padmé houm !' M. Hue's translation is, 'Oh ! the jewel in the lotus ! Amen.' This is the prayer which the Thibetans recite on their rosaries, and their devotion to it is astonishing. Some persons even keep Lamas in their pay, for the purpose of travelling through the country, and engraving it on rocks. The following is the Regent's explanation of it. 'Animated beings are divided into six classes,—Angels, demons, men, beasts, birds, and reptiles; these correspond to the six syllables of the formula. 'Animated beings, according to their merit or demerit, pass continually through these classes, till they have attained perfection, when they are absorbed and lost in the great essence of Budha, that is, in the great universal soul from which all souls emanate, and in which all souls, after their temporary migrations, must mingle and re-unite. Animated beings, according to their respective classes, have their peculiar means for sanctifying themselves, for rising into a superior class, for obtaining perfection, and finally absorption. Men who recite very often and very devoutly "Om, mani, padmé houm !" escape falling back after their death into any of the six classes corresponding to the six syllables of the formula, and obtain the fulness of being, by their absorption into the eternal and universal soul of Budha.' We suppose, therefore, that the formula may be described as

to) of a sanguinary battle, a kind of Armageddon, between the great parties of good and evil, with first a persecution then a triumph of the cause of religion—the derivation of the human race from three brothers, with a variety of other coincidences with Christianity in general, or with the peculiarities of Romanism. But there is one feature far too prominent to be omitted in any sketch of Tartar religion—the mass of alleged miracles by which the people are still amused or cheated. These are generally whimsical, sometimes childish, and sometimes revolting. Of the whole mass of trickery, Lamas are the preachers and agents. It is they who frame horoscopes, exorcise diseases, handle red-hot iron, command empty vessels to fill themselves with water, or rip up their own bowels and instantaneously close the wound. Of the superstitions thus propagated, some are evidently accepted with entire faith by devout and well-meaning Lamas, who imagine with the most undoubting confidence that they are repelling brigands by setting up with much ceremony and many prayers a ‘Pyramid of Peace;’ that they are laying up treasure in heaven by grinding out prayers in a prayer-mill; and that in scattering little paper horses to the wind they are furnishing a supply of animals to distressed travellers.

Sometimes, however, the impostures are unmistakeable and impudent, and among these the Lamanesque treatment of disease deserves especial notice. All disease, according to the Lamas, is diabolical possession. A ‘Tchutgour’ has taken possession of the patient. He is first assailed by medicine, in regard of which it may be recorded, as an index to the state of Tartar science, that it is considered indifferent whether the patient swallow the medicine or the prescription. ‘Avaler le nom du remède, ou le remède lui-même, disent les Tartares, cela revient absolument au même.’ If the devil yields at once to this, it is well; if not, he must be besieged with prayers suitable to his quality. The dignity of the Tchutgour is generally proportionate to the rank and wealth of the energumen. Poor men are invariably possessed by trumpery devils, requiring slight liturgical treatment. Rich men are sure to be inhabited by a mighty spirit, one of the lords of the nether world, ‘et comme il n’est pas décent qu’un grand Tchutgour voyage comme un diablotin, on doit lui préparer de beaux habits, un beau chapeau, une belle paire de bottes, et surtout un jeune et vigoureux cheval.’ Sometimes he is even unreasonable enough to require horses for his family and servants. After these attentions, which are represented as indispensable, the cere-

being in some way or other an aspiration after the Buddhist heaven, though it is difficult to make out that the particular words have any definite meaning in the mouths of those who recite them.

monial commences, which usually results in killing or curing the patient. In either case, however, the operation is considered as successful—according to the prevailing ideas of Lamanesque success. In either case the ejection of the Tchutgour is complete, though in one the patient may have been put to the temporary inconvenience of a transmigration. The ceremony does not always confine itself to prayers; more violent persuasives are at times resorted to. In one case, where M. Huc himself witnessed the operation, a fever-devil was burnt in effigy, and the patient led in procession with a grotesque accompaniment of clappings, howlings, and every species of musical and unmusical clatter that could be produced for the occasion. In this case the woman was cured without the necessity of transmigration, though at a considerable expense in respect of provisions and apparatus.

The better class of Lamas disown these absurdities. ‘When a man is sick,’ said the honest superior of a convent to the missionaries, ‘it is good to pray, for Budha is the lord of life and death. It is he who governs the transmigration of all living beings. It is also well to take remedies; for the great gift of medicinal herbs is also from Budha. That the devil may inhabit a sick man is credible; but that in order to prevail upon him to depart, he must be furnished with clothes and a horse, this is a mere figment of ignorant and swindling Lamas.’ Nor do the conjuring Lamas stand well with their more thoughtful brethren. It is not thought respectable for a priest to be able to lay open his own entrails and shut them up again, as if they were a mere cupboard. The conjurors are a loose set, and their practices are considered revolting, if not impious; but they amuse the people, and feed a belief in the supernatural, which, if corrupt in its developments, is the foundation of much that is good and much that is useful to the hierarchy. And so, though partially disavowed, these performances are not prohibited by the ecclesiastical authorities, and are even exhibited at set times “*con approv.*” M. Huc does not take upon himself to suggest any European analogy to this mixture of sense and religion, with credulity, imposture and connivance at imposture—the connivance of men who are not quite honest enough to put down what they think it profitable that others should believe; who contrive to patronize without committing themselves—who wish their system to be all things to all men—reasonable and philosophical to the intelligent foreigner, coarse and effective to the uninformed people. A Protestant imagination will supply the gap only too freely; and perhaps a parallel might be furnished from what has been already quoted in these pages.

But M. Hue professes to have inquired into many of the wonders of Tartary, and to have satisfied himself that some of them really could not have been effected without supernatural intervention. We have already seen his view of the election of Grand Lamas. But this was founded on report only, though vouched, as he conceived, by trustworthy authority. In one case, however, he speaks as an eye-witness, and very curious his statements are. On the spot where Tsong-Kaba, the modern reformer of Buddhism, at the age of three years, cut off his hair, and devoted himself to a religious life, grows a miraculous tree, marked, it is said, on every leaf with characters of the sacred language of Thibet, and diffusing around it an exquisite perfume. It is to be seen at the convent already mentioned, which owes to it the name of Koun-boum, or ten thousand pictures. It is covered with a silver dome, the offering of the great Emperor Khang-hi. Our missionaries examined it, and here is their account of what they saw :

‘Yes, this tree still lives; and we had heard it too often spoken of during our journey, not to have become somewhat impatient to see it. At the foot of the mountain on which the monastery is built, and not far from the principal Buddhist temple, is a large square enclosure of brick. We entered this vast court, and examined at our leisure the wonderful tree, some of whose branches we had seen from the outside. We looked first at the leaves with eager curiosity, and we were aghast with astonishment at seeing actually on each of them very well formed Thibetan characters, of a green colour, sometimes darker, sometimes lighter than the leaf itself. Our first thought was to suspect the Lamas of imposture; but after examining it all with the most minute attention, we were unable to discover the least fraud. The characters seemed to us to make part of the leaf, like the veins and fibres; they do not always choose the same place; sometimes they are at the point, or in the middle of the leaf, sometimes at the bottom or on the sides; the youngest leaves show the characters in a half formed state; the bark of the trunk, and of the branches, which peels off somewhat like the plane-tree, is similarly loaded with characters. If you break off a piece of the old bark, you see on the new the indeterminate form of the characters, which are already beginning to germinate; and, what is singular, they often differ from those above them. We sought everywhere, but in vain, for some trace of imposture; the perspiration stood in drops on our foreheads. Abler inquirers may perhaps be able to give a satisfactory explanation of this singular tree; for ourselves, we must give it up. People will doubtless smile at our ignorance, but for that we care not, if they do not suspect the truth of our account.

‘The tree of ten thousand pictures appeared very old; its trunk, which three men could hardly embrace, is not more than eight feet high: the branches do not grow upwards, but feather, and are very thick; some are withered and falling from old age; the leaves are evergreen, the wood of a reddish colour, and of an exquisite smell, something like that of cinnamon. The Lamas told us that during the summer, about the eighth moon, it had extremely beautiful red flowers. They also assured us that there was no other tree of the kind in existence; that people had tried to multiply it by seeds and grafts in many monasteries of Thibet, but every attempt had been fruitless.’—*Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 113—115.

But though M. Huc declines to put forward any explanation of this phenomenon, he has, as we have seen, a general theory on the subject of Buddhist miracles. They are the work of the devil, to support the Buddhist religion. The father of lies works them to keep alive the faith of his worshippers. M. Huc applies the same theory to the Lamas who hack themselves to pieces, and he has even preserved the form of invocation—telling, as he conceives, its own story—by which a friend of his was accustomed (not in his presence, however) to fill an empty glass with water. Whoever is the agent addressed, the conjuror is certainly on easy, not to say familiar terms with him.

‘I know thee; thou knowest me. Come, my old friend, do what I ask you. Bring water, and fill the vessel that I present to thee. To fill a vessel with water, what is that for thy great power? I know that thou chargest high for a vessel of water. No matter; do what I ask, and fill this vessel that I present to thee. We will settle accounts hereafter. At the proper time thou shalt take all thy dues.’—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 310, 311.

In dealing, however, with this theory, it is very material to observe that the Buddhist religion, in favour of which this diabolical interference is supposed to take place, appears to be very much better than any thing else which the people would get instead of it. It stands opposed, not to Christianity, but to the hard and selfish unbelief which M. Huc imputes to the Chinese. It appears, if he is to be believed, to humanize and elevate those whom it influences at all; it teaches them to admire and practise brotherly kindness, to control the appetites, to dwell on the thought of God and another life. Everywhere, indeed, it is tainted with falsehood and imperfection; but placed by the side of what it supersedes, it is good and true. On the other hand, when brought into the presence of Christianity, it assumes the attitude, not of a fanatical enemy, not even of a jealous rival, but of a curious and respectful inquirer. It is the sceptical mandarin who persecutes, the devout Lama welcomes and considers Christianity. If such power were given to the evil spirit, he might well exert it to crumble and deface the fragments of truth which still appear majestically amidst the superstitions of Buddhism; he might well employ himself in leading its votaries from lofty thoughts and kindly actions, into puerile and grotesque superstition. He might well attempt to debase their conception of what was divine by familiarising them with the idea of supernatural absurdity. The religion, in short, and its circumstances being what M. Huc describes them, the evil spirit might well occupy himself in corrupting, but scarcely, one would think, in supporting it.

Apparent inversions of the order of nature which are either unconnected with any religious system, or appear to vouch for

one which we believe to be false or imperfect, form a standing difficulty to men of educated minds, as they are apt to be the objects of a greedy appetite in the unlearned. We do not mean that we see the slightest philosophical difficulty in miracles as such. We cannot see any such difficulty. Applying to this question the only feeble analogy which is within our reach, we do not find that finite beings consider themselves precluded from correcting the irregularities or controlling the course of what may be called their own creations. A watchmaker who has made a clock does not merely leave it to follow the law of its construction; he does not even content himself with that stated interference which is necessary to keep it in motion; that is to say, with winding it up at fixed intervals. On the contrary, if it gains or loses, he interferes arbitrarily and at his own discretion to set or regulate it. So of a labourer who sets up a beehive, or of a monarch who founds a colony. Neither of them holds himself tied to any principle of non-intervention. They interfere when they please and as they please, either for their own benefit, or for the better regulation of what they have called into existence. All analogies, therefore, within our reach, (whatever their value on such a subject,) would incline us to expect from the Author of nature such extraordinary interferences in the conduct of His world as may be useful to keep it in the course which he has assigned to it. Of course, if it be assumed at starting that nature is regulated by nothing but a system of fixed laws, it is a contradiction in terms to assert that those laws are ever interfered with. Or again, if it be assumed that there is no experience, (*i.e.* no historical evidence) of miracles, it is a contradiction in terms to assert that there is. If the abstract argument against miracles resolves itself into either of these statements, it is a mere *petitio principii*; if it means more, we are wholly unable to understand its force. But we Christians, to whom God has given certain conceptions of His own dignity, goodness and power, find a wholly distinct source of perplexity in apparently supernatural phenomena, which either in respect of their own character, or in respect of the system with which they are connected, and for which they appear to be the vouchers, conflict with the notions which we have obtained of Him, and on which our whole system of religious belief is based. In dealing with such phenomena we are at once launched on a sea of conjecture. Some rays of light we may extract from Scripture; some from human science; some from every-day experience; some from the dicta of good and thoughtful men; but after all, we do but grope, and can only arrive at a dogmatical conclusion by arbitrarily dismissing from our mind considerations which we cannot satisfactorily dispose of by reason.

We have unmistakeable Scripture authority for ascribing certain phenomena of this world to the agency of devils, who during our Lord's life not only assumed the form of ordinary diseases, but evinced a superhuman knowledge of His person and character, and were treated by Him as living and individual spirits. And no doubt, having arrived at these two great superhuman causes, the Author of truth, and the father of lies, there is a kind of intellectual satisfaction in viewing all the inexplicable phenomena of the world, not only as flowing directly from one or other of these agencies, but as being in one case signs from the Almighty to guarantee the truth of the system in which they appear, in the other, artifices of the devil to oppress and mislead mankind. We seem to be dealing clearly, boldly, and sufficiently with alleged results, by referring them to established causes. On such causes it is satisfactory to lean, and we are tempted to force all phenomena under one or the other of them. And yet we are surrounded by facts which warn us against such precipitancy. There is a wide intermediate field—not less real because we cannot dogmatize about it. High authorities have believed in the divine origin of miracles, which yet are connected with a false or imperfect system. S. Augustine ascribes the wonders which in his day were wrought at the shrines (*memoriæ*) of heretical saints, to God's blessing on the faith of the people. And thoughtful men have believed that even in the Delphic oracles, and other wonders of paganism, the hand of the True God was discernible, so directing the powers of the spiritual and physical world, that they should testify in the midst of darkness to the existence at least of a religion, and to the truth of those moral laws which He has appointed. Nor is such a view without some sanction from Scripture. The evil spirits of Judea cried out, 'Jesus, thou son of God, art thou come hither to torment us before our time?' 'What have we to do with Thee?' The spirit of divination (not '*πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον*,' but '*πνεῦμα Πύθωνος*,' the 'Pythian spirit,') at Philippi, constantly proclaimed of the Apostles; 'These men are the servants of the Most High God, which show *unto us* the way of salvation.' The contrast is very remarkable, even if we are unable to determine its precise significance. There are other considerations of a different kind, which cannot be dismissed in dealing with this subject. It is extremely difficult to assign limits to the powers of imposture. The feats of an ordinary juggler are such that most of us would unhesitatingly pronounce them to be impossible, if it were not notorious that they were publicly performed every day, and that the tricks could be learnt for a few guineas. Far more astonishing are those phe-

nomena of mesmerism which are established beyond a doubt, though running wholly counter to the laws of nature, as hitherto known to us. The clearly authenticated phenomena of concurrent dreams are, according to our ideas, too fantastic to be ascribed to supernatural agency,—yet too strangely minute in their coincidence to be easily accounted for by any other known cause. Wesley's ghost and Highland second-sight remain on record, with enough evidence to be puzzling, not to speak of a variety of other phenomena which it is almost equally difficult to explain or to explain away. It appears to us, therefore, that on questions of this kind we must be content to be very much at sea; and our Lord's prediction that among the perplexities of the latter days the 'lying wonders' would be such, as 'if it were possible to deceive the very elect,' though no doubt directly pointed against the miracles of Antichrist, yet enforces upon us strongly our general liability to error when dealing with this subject. We think, therefore, that even if M. Huc were a more cautious and critical investigator than he is, we might fairly pause before either adopting his explanation of the wonders which he records, or offering any of our own.

We will conclude by shortly recapitulating the main points of that strange analogy which in the latter part of this article we have attempted to illustrate. *Budhism* is the Catholicism, the 'universal' religion, of heathen Asia; surpassing in antiquity and numerical importance Christianity itself. Spreading through a variety of kingdoms, and apparently varying its character according to the national peculiarities which it encounters, it yet centres in an ecclesiastical personage who unites a small temporal sovereignty with a religious supremacy vaster than that of the Pope himself. Resting upon this centre, the religion is supported and propagated by an immense body of unmarried priests—partly attached to families, (the nomad form of a parish,) partly detached from the world as hermits or wanderers, and partly collected in religious communities, which are bound together by an imposing if not severe discipline, under their respective heads, and comprise the strength of the religion and the learning of the country. Its theology is founded on an ancient revelation, round which a traditional development has accumulated, partly from a series of semi-judicial decisions, partly by the continuous and uniform workings of a multitude of subtle, enthusiastic, and imaginative minds. In the department of theology it reflects strangely, though delusively, the Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity, of Heaven and Hell, the Ten Commandments of the Mosaic Law, and often the language or

sentiments of Scripture. Its philosophy is careful, elaborate, and appear stopossess a scriptural kind of depth and completeness. In morals it inculcates the vanity of all things earthly, and the duty of universal benevolence, and proceeds to hold up as the highest object of human existence a life of continued religious meditation, fed by the most rigorous and unflinching asceticism. Its saints are of this deeply mortified class, and the anecdotes which record their virtues, their ascetic feats, and their supernatural powers, are at once strangely noble, touching, and absurd. Similarly, the rules into which their morality develops itself, display alternately a piercing depth and force, a careful and purpose-like exactitude, and a mere trifling particularity. Their ceremonial is conducted in magnificent temples crowded with images—the objects of worship more or less gross, according as the worshippers are more or less refined in their ideas of Deity. Their dignitaries wear the dress of a Roman Catholic Bishop, and their worship is conducted in a foreign language, and in a solemn melody chanted by alternate choirs of priests. The imaginations of the people are fed, and their devotion kept alive, by a multitude of the wildest legends, by processions, pilgrimages, and by daily recurring miracles, which the authorities appear sometimes to disclaim, sometimes to sanction, and everywhere to tolerate.

Yet, with all this similarity in the results and apparatus of religion, it is really doubtful whether the existence of a Deity is part of the Buddhist creed. It has appropriated and developed with wonderful vigour the captivating circumstances of religion. It is also studded with those corruptions which result from the determination to make religion all things to all men—coarse and melo-dramatic to the gross-minded populace—subtle and ingenious to the keen philosopher—rigorous and uncompromising to the enthusiast. But its deficiency is nothing less than the idea which is the first and fundamental idea of all religion—that of an everlasting and ever-present Deity, knowing all things, caring for all things, and always watchfully interfering for the good of his creatures.

We leave to historians the task of tracing the origin of this phenomenon—its connexion, if any, with Judaism or early Christianity—with the Pythagoreans or the Manichees—with the Nestorian Tartars, or Franciscan Missionaries. The most obvious moral which suggests itself to ourselves is the deceptiveness of those magnificent adjuncts which are to be found connected with such puerile superstitions, and clothing so rotten a trunk.

ART. II.—*America and the American Church.* By the Rev. HENRY CASWALL, M.A. &c. *Second Edition.* London: Mozleys. 1851.

‘OUT of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.’ This divinely-recorded maxim of human ethics may equally be applied to the language of the pen, as to its more exact signification. In literature, generally, we like to find traces of some fitness in the author for the task undertaken, or we set him down as an adventurer, who would occupy our time for his own honour and glory, or for his own profit, more than for our instruction or amusement. In an age when so many are disposed to turn authors, it behoves the public to be on their guard against impostures of this kind; nor, on the whole, do we think modern criticism to be wanting in the acuteness necessary to discriminate the presence or absence of some kind of heart from which the pen speaketh. But here, as elsewhere, the *heart* is an ambiguous term. It may either signify that kind of reality which involves the whole character, which is founded on habits, and is the result of labour, which represents an individual *life*; or it may signify the partial and inconsistent reality of mental excitement, or represent but the enthusiasm of the moment. The reading world sternly requires one of these; it likes not to swallow mere wind; but it is not always very particular in exacting the more severe interpretation which we have given to the dictation of the heart. There is, however, a great degree of satisfaction, where the subjects under notice are important, in welcoming a book as the testimony of a real practical man, who writes what he has seen and digested, and brings it to bear on questions of the day. It is a common and natural feeling, that theories are easily written, but are of little service unless facts or valuable evidence are to be obtained in support of them.

Examined on these principles, there is a singular appropriateness in Mr. Caswall’s book now placed before us; for we cannot call it a second edition of an old work, as the enlargements are so great and so important that we may examine it altogether as a book of the present day, and accept it as a valuable witness on some principal points of our Church struggles which happen just now to be under discussion. The appropriateness of this book consists, partly in the fact that its author appears at the critical moment of his own Church’s history, when she wants largeness and liberality in her practical system and her government, and gives us fourteen years’ personal experience and research in another Communion, where these same questions have been

working themselves out, with the additional test of being in another soil; and partly that it is not only a book of history or of observations, but a record of exactly that kind of intercommunion between two Churches which is likely to help on any fair mutual inquiries that may be beneficial to both sides. But what is the specific object of such mutual inquiries, and how do we hope to make them beneficial in the case of England and America at the present time? When two kindred institutions exist under different circumstances, it is always useful to compare results. By that means certain weak points in the one derive strength from the discovery that in the other case no such weakness exists, while it, in turn, imparts strength where the other needs it. For instance, the English Church has the prestige of years, and the dignity of long political power, but she wants freedom and versatility; whereas the American Church has the latter, but wants the former. In these points, therefore, they are a mutual strength to each other. This kind of comparison is beneficial, even where the respective institutions claim no particular unity of being, but are only for objects generally similar; as for example, the hospitals and asylums, or civic corporations of America, might be compared with our own with mutual advantage, in order to discover the best way of carrying out the abstract duties of charity and of self-government. Yet, however nearly the management of one approached to that of the other in consequence of such comparison, there would not be any corporate unity between them; they would be isolated institutions; the only bond of connexion being in man's conscience or his instinct. But if we suppose a common bond of external unity, a common origin, support, and government, essentially and radically shared by both, it of course follows that intercommunications, as tending to develop it, even if its existence should be doubted, will be tenfold desirable. Much of the difference of opinion on religious subjects which now agitates the world, may be traced to this source; viz. whether men look on the Christian religion in one or the other of the two suppositions we have described: whether the Christian religion is an abstract mental principle called Christianity, which, like the principle of benevolence or of self-preservation, may work itself out to the surface of society in any way it likes; or whether it is essentially connected with any absolute laws of visible existence, as the practice of loyalty in any particular country is absolutely dependent on recognising the government of that country in its visible constitution.

To those who, like ourselves, hold the theory of the Church, as a catholic and visible unity, there is no small evidence, on their side, to be derived from the present phenomena of the

American Church; and there is much that tells with great effect against the latitudinarian efforts of English politics. America, as being a new world, has been taken by the old one as a nursery-garden wherein to sow wild seed, for the chance of improved varieties of the original stock. The ground was open and free, the soil fresh, the seed most various and promiscuous, the perils and hardships, if not less, yet of a different sort; and the result must surely be a fair test of such innate qualities as, in the nature of things, are inseparable from their kind.

This is true in the religion of America perhaps more than in any other particular. Nothing can be wilder or more varied than the importations of the Christian religion which originally spread over that continent; and in the United States the non-interference of the civil power has given full room for the sorting together of these promiscuous elements, and for the development of each according to its permanent value. If, therefore, we see that the same visible constitution which Churchmen have associated with the Christian religion at home, stands the test in America, nay, flourishes more and more with the increase of social order and intellectual advancement, we may hence gather that it is an offshoot of the very same tree, that One Vine whose suckers penetrate to all lands, and of whose secret intercommunication across the wild and stormy oceans of nature and of nations we may find an outward type in the mysterious galvanic wire, as now used, to bind shore with shore. It is not too much to say, that America affords proof of the Church system being the congenial and natural helpmate of civilization; the requirements and propensities of each seem to fit in together, in proportion as the universal disorder pertaining to a new country gradually subsides. On two points especially does the history of the American Church illustrate this assertion: the one is Episcopacy, as being the ordained form of Church government, and the other is the necessity of Synodical action to the true energy of the Church. These two subjects Mr. Caswall has, we should imagine, kept always steadily in view throughout his experience, with a true conviction how aptly the testimony which he is enabled to arrange in the form of his present work may be made to bear on his Church's position at home.

Nor only let us accept the facts of the American Church as barren evidence, or as inducements to self-complacency, but let us approach this consideration with a free and reforming spirit. Let us respect her suggestions of some adaptation in ecclesiastical affairs to modern times, and be willing to engraft some popular elements, which seem consistently to arise from certain changes in society and in the Church herself, that we already

acknowledge, and to which we are irretrievably committed, even if we wished to transfer ourselves back to an earlier stage of the world's growth.

The early history of the American Church presents one long continued struggle, amid perils that carry us back to primitive ages, for certain conditions of existence without which she felt herself unable to fulfil her mission or to show what she really was. For more than a century she was refused a native Episcopate to her constant petition addressed to a British government. Must not those have been dark ages of Church feeling, when such a thing was possible? The notion of a Bishop was so entirely absorbed in the baronial dignity of our own sees, that it seemed intolerable to grant that title to mere overlookers of the Church on the other side of the Atlantic. The Erastian principle was deeply laid in our constitution after 1688, by an intense jealousy of allowing any privileges of religion to proceed from our own Church except with precisely the same civil appendages that pertained to them in England. The Protestant cry aided this result; for it first ignored all foreign bishops in the eyes of an English government, and then made our rulers fancy that the very name of Bishop, as an English word, had no other meaning than as implying a certain rank in our constitution. As American peerages, therefore, were not granted, it seemed inconsistent to grant bishoprics. All political parties seemed to arrive at the same conclusion on this subject. The Whigs were the Church's more natural foes, but the Tories practically were not much better; the former tied down the Church on principle, and the latter did so too, though on the idea that they were supporting her dignity by not making her functions too common. The absolute and essential distinctness of the Episcopal office from any appendages which an individual government may attach to it, was not seen by the Walpoles, and is but dimly seen by the Russells, though the impossibility of any valid legislation against the late papal aggression, such as could be made consistent with our general liberal policy, must have opened the eyes of many to discover the logical flaw involved in that confusion of mind which holds any more limited view of the Episcopate.

But let us trace the early course of Christ's holy religion in the new world of England's colonial empire in North America. A strangely diverse crew seem to have crossed over from Europe, bearing the name of Christians, yet the first stone of all, laid by these wanderers, was propitious:—

* On the 26th day of April, 1607, two years before the settlement of Canada the French, seven years before the founding of New York by the Dutch, and thirteen years before the landing of the Puritans in New England, a

small band of colonists arrived on that coast, denominated, in honour of their queen, Virginia. They brought with them the prevalent habits of the higher orders of English society, and although adventurers, they had not forgotten their duty to God. Religious considerations had been combined with the motives which led to their voluntary expatriation. As members of the lately reformed Church of England, they had been required by their sovereign to provide for the preaching of the Gospel among themselves and the neighbouring Indians, and had been taught to regard their undertaking as a work which, by the providence of God, might tend "to the glory of His Divine Majesty," and "the propagating of the Christian Religion." A wise and pious clergyman, Robert Hunt by name, had accompanied them on their perilous voyage; and a humble building was soon erected as a place of worship, according to the usage of the Church of England. On the 14th of May, the day after their first landing, the colonists partook of the Lord's Supper at the hand of their pastor; and North America commenced its career of civilization with the celebration of the most holy mystery of the Catholic Church. Upon a peninsular projecting from the northern shore of James River, may still be seen the ruins of the more substantial edifice afterwards erected; and this, with its surrounding burial-ground, remains almost the sole memorial of Jamestown.' — Pp. 124, 125.

For a few years the Church of England was the only form of Christianity existing in the northern part of the continent. Sects, however, soon multiplied, and left the Church to be but one of many. In 1614 New York was colonized by the Dutch, who brought with them their own confession of faith and Presbyterian form of government. In 1620 the stream of English Puritans began to flow into Massachusetts. In 1627 the Swedes and Finns introduced Lutheranism into Delaware and New Jersey. Maryland was settled by Roman Catholics in 1634, and Pennsylvania by Quakers in 1681. Such were the various elements left to ferment together much as they liked. The Church did, indeed, enjoy some of the privileges of an establishment in the southern colonies; glebes were set apart, churches built, and a geographical demarcation of parishes was partially effected; but in the north she derived no benefit from any legal enactments, and her congregations were far from numerous. The Puritans of New England, not forgetful of their old prejudices, took special delight in persecuting the remnant of Church people, and in frustrating every effort to better their condition.

'It is to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts that the United States are chiefly indebted for the diffusion of the doctrines and faith of the Reformed Church. That Society was incorporated in 1701, and owed its existence, in a great measure, to the exertions of the zealous Dr. Bray, the Commissary of Maryland, already mentioned. By means of this valuable institution, the greater part of the clergy residing in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, were maintained, and the congregations were soon greatly increased. To this Society a liberal grant of land was made by one of the colonial authorities, which, under equitable management, might have proved eminently serviceable to the Church. When the territory of Vermont was first surveyed, the country was divided into townships, containing thirty-six square miles each, a

hundred and fourteen of which were granted by Governor Wentworth of New Hampshire. This gentleman was a member of the Church of England, and determined, on this occasion, to advance its interests. Accordingly, he reserved in each of the townships, one *right* of land, containing about 330 acres, for the first minister who might settle there, a second right as a glebe for the Church of England, and a third as an endowment for the Gospel Propagation Society. But the surveyors of the land being Puritans, or at least hostile to the Church, took care to render the grant as useless as they possibly could. Hence they sometimes managed that the portions reserved for the glebes, and those for the Society, should overlap, or entirely cover one another, while sometimes the Church beheld her property at the bottom of ponds and marshes, amid barren rocks, or on the precipitous sides of mountains. Still, among so much, there was of course a proportion of good land, and a considerable quantity not altogether worthless. This property was confiscated at the Revolution, but was finally recovered by a judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, pronounced against the State of Vermont, at the suit of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. It is now the endowment of the Church in that State, and assists, to a moderate extent, the voluntary exertions of the people.'—Pp. 129, 130.

Depressed as the Church was, and feeble in her efforts, she had still life enough to feel the true cause of her weakness. The clergy in the south became disorderly, while those in the north seemed to present but a small surface of resistance to the overwhelming torrents of dissent; but in both cases it was felt that the Church's true government was the great thing wanted. There was no Bishop to preserve discipline or to perform some of the principal offices of the Church. Nominally, the whole of British North America was under the episcopal charge of the Bishop of London; little, however, could he know of a diocese which in extent almost rivalled that claimed by the ultramontane theory of Rome, without any vicars-apostolic to perform episcopal functions. Ordination could only be obtained by crossing the Atlantic, and confirmation or consecration of churches were altogether left out of the system of the Church. With about as much meaning might the supervision of the swans on the Mississippi be given to the lord mayor of London, in addition to those on the Thames, as the continent of North America be tacked on to the diocese of London. The vastness of such an addition, as compared with the original, is simply throwing contempt on the whole duties of the office. With regard to Ordination, the effect is thus stated:—

'The few clergy in the country were all ordained in England, and of the candidates who were sent from America with this object, one-fifth perished at sea, or died by sickness resulting from exposure or change of climate. The voyage, too, was expensive as well as dangerous, and from these causes many young men who might have been ornaments to the Church became preachers in the dissenting denominations.'—P. 131.

The struggle to supply this want is a curious instance of the management of spiritual functions by the civil power:—

'Sensible of their necessities, the members of the Church of England in America had exerted themselves as early as the reign of Charles II., to obtain an Episcopate from the mother country. Their letters and memorials supplied for a whole century a connected chain of expostulations and petitions to this effect, yet still the authorities in England remained deaf to their entreaties. The accession of Queen Anne encouraged sanguine expectations of success, and the Society for Propagating the Gospel led the way in the efforts which were put forth at that period. Preparations were already made for founding at once four Bishoprics for America, when the queen's death extinguished for a time the rising hopes of the Church.'—P. 132.

The opposition which the introduction of Bishops met with in the Puritan party of America, exhibits the doctrine of partial toleration in a manner worthy of a more recent question:—

'Dr. Mayhew, a bitter Puritan in Boston, in his reply to this pamphlet, declared that the Gospel Propagation Society transcended its powers in appointing missionaries in the villages and sea-ports of New England. He represented the proposed appointment of Bishops for America as an aggressive measure, and while claiming complete liberty for Dissenters, resisted the introduction of the only means by which Churchmen could possess the full enjoyment of their religion.'—P. 133.

There were very general fears, even among the clergy themselves, that Bishops would be made political instruments in the hands of the British ministry. The revolution was now at hand, and the Church had hard work to maintain her existence, through the prejudices that raged against her during that long contest between the colony and the mother country. Churchmen were generally loyal, from the connexion which they felt to exist between themselves and the Church in England. That connexion also, on general grounds, apart from the personal loyalty of Churchmen, was one of the ties which the lovers of colonial independence would be sure to aim at severing, amongst others more directly secular. Nor could we have anticipated any other result, except on very much higher grounds of churchmanship than this country had taught her colony. If we forced them to look on the Church as necessarily depending for existence on ecclesiastical governors in England, and those, nominees of the Crown itself, of course the Church would be sure to suffer as part of the political system which was to be thrown off. An unfair and sacrilegious use of the Church had been made by the English government, to maintain a forced connexion with the mother country, having, at the same time, obviously no desire to promote her spiritual welfare and usefulness; and, as a matter of just retribution, all civil connexion was to be lost, while the two Churches remain in spiritual unity, as a witness that the only true Head of the Church is the King of kings and Lord of lords.

During the war itself the whole Church seemed to be overthrown; Trinity Church in New York was burnt down; most of

the laws in her favour were repealed, and the work of a century and a half seemed lost. When American independence was finally recognised by Great Britain, the Propagation Society withdrew its support; Church lands were confiscated; churches were in ruins, or were desecrated; numbers of the clergy fled; no centre of unity remained, and no ecclesiastical government existed. Such was the state of a Church, when exposed to the stormy world of politics, to which its true government and its local independence had been denied. Providence, however, never so far forsook her, as that the identity between the branch of the Church of England before the revolution and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States could be doubted. Amid all the ruin and confiscation, enough was left to be a sure witness to all men that these two were one and the same. The reviving efforts of the Church after the declaration of American independence are thus described, wherein we see a new element of the Church system begin to arise:—

The great object with Churchmen in America was now to obtain an Episcopate of their own, possessed of a true and regular succession from the Apostles. At the same time they saw the necessity of some bond of union which should prevent the adoption of varying measures, and secure the unity of the remaining clergy and congregations. The difficulties in the way of obtaining an Episcopate were very great, and their speedy removal appeared an improbable event. Hence arose the strange ecclesiastical phenomenon of Synodical Action preceding the pastoral rule of Bishops. In 1783 the Church in Maryland held its first Convention, in which it declared its right to preserve and complete itself as an entire Church, agreeably to its ancient usages and professions. It maintained its lawful right to the churches, chapels, and glebes, formerly belonging to the Church of England, and asserted the duty of the Church, when represented in a Synod of its ministers and people, to adapt its worship to the altered circumstances of America. The Church in Pennsylvania met in May, 1784, and declared its intention of maintaining the doctrines of the Gospel as held by the Church of England, and of adhering to the Liturgy as far as consistent with the Revolution. In the September of the same year the Church in Massachusetts adopted similar resolutions. But already a decided step had been taken towards the formation of a collective body, representing the entire Church in the United States. In May, 1784, Mr. White, the chaplain of Congress, and some of the ministers of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania met at Brunswick, in New Jersey, to renew a Society for the relief of the widows and orphans of clergymen. On this occasion the general state of the Church was discussed, and it was determined to procure a larger assembly, for the purpose of agreeing on some general principles of union. Such a meeting was accordingly held at New York on the 5th of the ensuing October, on which occasion eight of the different States furnished some voluntary delegates. Although the members of the assembly were not vested with powers adequate to the emergency, they happily agreed on seven leading principles of union, which they recommended to the members of the Church in the different States. These principles acknowledged Episcopacy, and the Book of Common Prayer: and provided for a representative body of the Church, consisting of Clergy and Laity, who were to vote as distinct orders. It was also

resolved that such a General Convention, composed of deputies from each State, should assemble at Philadelphia on the 27th of September in the following year. If, in the meantime, any Bishop should have been duly consecrated and settled, he was to be considered as *ex officio* a member of the Convention. The entire existing framework of the American Church has been constructed upon these primary principles.²—Pp. 137—139.

So universal was the instinct for Synodical action and for Episcopacy, when the American Church began to be free, that the Clergy of Connecticut, acting separately, had held a convention, appointed a bishop elect, and sent him off to England for consecration, before the British troops had finally evacuated New York. Dr. Seabury, the object of their choice, found impediments in the way of consecration by the Archbishop which an Act of Parliament could only remove; nor were the ministry of the day willing to introduce such an act, without an official assurance that it would not be offensive to the new government in America. He therefore went to Scotland, and was consecrated at Aberdeen, in 1784. In the following year, the first General Convention was held in Philadelphia, which, after the expression of some rather heterogeneous views, as under the circumstances would naturally be expected, finally resolved to enter into communication with the English bishops, with the view of obtaining Episcopal Succession from them. Without entering upon the particulars of those intercommunications, which chiefly concerned the alterations in the Prayer-book, about which the English bishops seem to have acted with great judgment, discretion, and courtesy, it is sufficient to our purpose to state, that, all difficulties being overcome, Dr. White and the Rev. Samuel Provoost were consecrated, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, on the 4th of February, 1787, to the dioceses of Pennsylvania and New York. One other had been elected, but he was too poor to bear the expense of the voyage, and tendered his resignation. There was at first some hesitation in assuming local titles, from fear of offence; and Dr. White, modestly, but with considerable circumlocution, denominated himself 'Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.' The conduct of the Romish Church soon proved this caution unnecessary, and they at once adopted their proper local titles—though, unfortunately, they used territorial rather than urban designations. They did not so much erect Sees, as take the superintendence of a district. Hence a Cathedral—the Bishop's seat in his city—is yet unknown in the United States.

We have now traced the American Church from 1607 to 1787. We have seen the wretched bondage in which she was kept, for want of that government she was ever craving to possess, and we have witnessed the utter inefficiency and decay of her spiritual

position. The time which has since elapsed, though all of it can well be remembered by many now living, affords a striking contrast with the previous history. For the present condition of the American Church we will refer to Mr. Caswall's personal narrative, with his valuable dissertations on many subjects that came within his observation; but to show the progress of the Church during this later period, we extract a short account of the last General Convention:—

'The General Convention of 1850 was held in Cincinnati, and although in the interval Romanizing as well as disorganizing influences had been active, the Church appeared more than ever a compact and united body. Twenty-eight Bishops were present in the Upper House; ninety-four clergymen and seventy-one of the laity sat in the Lower. Each of these 193 persons had travelled, on an average (at his own expense), about 650 miles, to reach the place of meeting; so that, on a moderate computation, the united costs of travelling alone must have exceeded 5,000*l.* before the members reached their homes. This Convention assembled chiefly by the aid of steam, and its proceedings were made known day by day through the medium of the electric telegraph. It was very plain, on this occasion, that the Laity in America were an element of strength, of influence, and of safety. Beyond the ranks of the clergy, a class of well-read and practical churchmen had arisen, who were found on the side of law and order, and who understood what was due to the Episcopal and Clerical office as well as to themselves.'—Pp. 155, 156.

We said that the Episcopate of the American Church could all be comprehended in the memory of many now living, and therefore may almost be said to be the offspring of our own generation. There is, however, one individual in that Church, with whose long career of noble and useful actions this fact seems to be connected with peculiar interest. Bishop Chase, now actively engaged in the diocese of Illinois, was thirteen years of age when Bishop White was consecrated in Lambeth Chapel, and having himself been consecrated by that father of the American Episcopate, has for thirty-four years been one of its most distinguished members. This seems to make us feel, in a personal manner, that an important revival of the episcopal office is a feature of our own day, especially in free and open states, in spite of much that has been said and done on the supposition that it is a relic of the dark ages, no longer to be considered a vital part of the Christian religion. Surely this *fact*, as proved in the United States and in our present colonies, will stand against all that may now be said or written at Lambeth or elsewhere, and will calm all fears as to a sudden subversion of our own Church constitution. When a great fact of this kind may be seen steadily rolling on in one direction, as part of the spirit of our age, we can afford to contemplate, even with stoical indifference, though with personal causes of regret, more agitation than a few ordination sermons and pamphlets have yet excited

in favour of lax notions as to the presence of the Apostolic order in the rulers of our Church.

The venerable Bishop Chase is so much connected with the early part of our author's residence in America, that some particulars of his life may well be read with interest, and are given with tokens of warm affection by Mr. Caswall. He was born in 1775, was descended of English Puritans, and himself educated at Dartmouth College, a dissenting institution. He there, however, acquired a wish to join the Church, chiefly from the study of her Prayer-book, and his influence upon his whole family was so great, that ultimately they all abandoned the Independent ranks, demolished their old meeting-house, and erected a church in its stead, not a voice being raised against the measure throughout the neighbourhood. In 1795 he was ordained deacon, and officiated in various parts of America until his consecration to the diocese of Ohio in 1819. The commencement of his episcopal life is thus described :—

‘Immediately on Bishop Chase's return to Ohio, he recommenced his missionary labours with greater energy than ever. The mitre, which added *nothing* to his private means, imposed upon him new sacrifices and increased exertions. His diocesan work, as he informs us in his “Reminiscences,” involved “vast distances of journeyings on horseback, under the burning sun and pelting rain, through the mud and amid the beech-roots, over log-bridges, and through swollen streams.” As might be expected, he reached the end of his circuit of “1,279 miles on horseback, with his constitution impaired, and his voice almost gone.” New cares met him on his return home. Three parishes were to be supplied with his personal ministrations, two of which were nearly fifteen miles distant from his residence. And again and again, whenever an opening appeared for introducing a knowledge of the Church, he was ready to undertake new journeys, and to encourage, by his presence, the efforts of his scattered brethren.’—Pp. 33, 34.

In 1823 Bishop Chase visited England, to obtain assistance in founding a College in his diocese for the training of clergy; and it is from this time that our author's personal narrative commences; for though only eighteen years of age, he followed the Bishop to the far west, and became a member of Kenyon College. His first Sunday after landing in New York presents a varied picture of the religious services of that city :—

‘The next day being Sunday, the hum of business was entirely suspended throughout the great city, and an agreeable stillness universally prevailed. At eleven o'clock I went to Grace Church, a fashionable place of worship in Broadway, where I obtained my first impressions of the American Episcopal Church. The appearance of the congregation was highly respectable. The church was beautifully clean and neat, the seats were thoroughly comfortable, and the pews and aisles were handsomely carpeted. The singing and chanting were scientifically performed, and as far as I could judge, the organ was a good one. The absence of a *clerk* surprised me at first, but I soon found that the responses of the congregation more than supplied the want of that functionary. The service was well read by Dr. Wainwright, the estimable rector, but, although substantially the same

with the English Liturgy, I was particularly struck with some minor alterations, which sounded curiously to ears habituated to the older form. The sermon was elegantly composed and forcibly delivered, and certainly was not inferior to the best discourses I had heard in England.

'In the afternoon I went to S. George's, a less fashionable place of worship, perhaps, than Grace Church, but filled with a congregation no less attentive and devout. The sermon was delivered by Mr. M'Ilvaine of Brooklyn, an eminent and popular preacher, who in process of time became my Bishop. It was designed to exhibit the distinction between the *devout* man and the *devotee*, with a view to the prevention of mere formalism in the serious business of religion. The contrast was forcibly drawn, and the two opposite characters having been conducted through the period of their probation, were finally represented as standing before the Searcher of all hearts at the Day of Judgment. A solemn application was then made to the consciences of all present, while the deepest interest was visible in the countenances of the numerous hearers.

'In the evening, from motives of curiosity, I looked into a large Methodist chapel, accompanied by my zealous fellow-passenger from Sheffield. Here I found an overwhelming congregation, the female part of which was seated on the right, and the males on the left side of the middle aisle. They were evidently of a very different class from those whom I had seen at Grace Church and S. George's; but it was left for subsequent experience to teach me how effectually the mismanagement of a century and a half, prior to the Revolution, had separated the great mass of the American population from the influence of the Church. The preacher occupied a spacious pulpit, or rather a broad platform, and was delivering himself with much emphasis and strong gesticulation. For my own part I could discover neither point nor connexion in the discourse, but the congregation listened with profound attention, and with occasional ejaculations, expressive of contrition or of praise.'—Pp. 9—11.

We cannot omit the following account of the College and episcopal residence for which our author had crossed the Atlantic. A youthful imagination, stimulated by the excitement of so long a journey, must have felt rather chilled when the object was at length reached:—

'The road from Mount Vernon to Gambier was then little more than a track, formed by felling the trees which obstructed the passage of vehicles. In some cases, where the soil was swampy, a species of road denominated *corduroy* had been formed, by laying logs close together across the track, and over these, with many a weary jolt, my conductor took his way. At length I reached the hill on which Gambier is situated, and earnestly looked upwards in the hope of beholding the streets and squares, which had made so splendid an appearance in the maps and plans published in England. On attaining the summit, I cast my eyes around, and perceived four small houses constructed of planks, two or three log-houses, and the unfinished walls of a large stone building in the distance. These were the village of Gambier and Kenyon College, and then, for the first time, I comprehended that the published plans represented a town in *design*, rather than in actual existence. I requested to be driven to the Bishop's residence, and to my consternation, I was deposited at the door of a small and rough log cabin, which could boast of but one little window, composed of four squares of the most common glass. "Is this the Bishop's Palace?" I involuntarily exclaimed. "Can this," I thought, "be the residence of the apostolic man, whose praise is in all the churches, and who is venerated by so many excellent persons in my native country?" It was even so; and, on knocking for admittance,

the door was opened by a dignified female, who soon proved to be the Bishop's lady herself. In reply to my inquiries, she informed me that the Bishop had gone to his mill for some flour, but that he would soon return. I had waited but a few minutes when I heard a powerful voice engaged in conversation outside, and immediately afterwards the Bishop entered with one of his head workmen. The good prelate, then fifty-three years of age, was of more than ordinary size, and his black cassock bore evident tokens of his recent visit to the mill. He was proceeding in his conversation with the foreman, when, on hearing my name mentioned, he turned to me and very courteously made inquiries respecting my journey and several of his friends in England. He then invited me to partake of his frugal meal, after which he desired me to accompany him to the College. On arriving at the unfinished edifice, I was amazed at the solidity of the structure. The walls were four feet thick at the foundation, but on the second story, upon which the builders were now engaged, the thickness was reduced to three feet. I ascended with my venerable guide to the highest point completed, from whence the eye wandered in every direction, as far as it could reach, over an ocean of apparently unbroken forest. While standing here, the Bishop explained several of his plans, and mentioned some of his numerous discouragements. At this moment he was almost destitute of funds, but he trusted that God would continue, as heretofore, to supply him, like Elijah in the wilderness. He often felt ready to sink under despondency; but the countenances of his noble English benefactors appeared to him in his dreams, and admonished him not to be disheartened. From the College we descended to a piece of ground but partially cleared of trees. "This," said the Bishop, "is Sutton Square, so named from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury." A little further on he informed me that I was in Bexley Square, and still further to the right was a thick portion of forest which he declared was Burgess Street, called after the name of the venerable Bishop of Salisbury. In another part of the surrounding woods he showed me the unoccupied site of a Church, to be denominated Rosse Chapel, from the Countess Dowager of Rosse. A large cucumber-tree occupied the place of the future altar, a spreading sumach stood in the place marked for the font, and a stately sycamore supplied the absence of the steeple.—Pp. 23—25.

About 10,000 persons are said to have been the number in Ohio who recognised Bishop Chase as their ecclesiastical head, and these were scattered amongst a population of every phase of religion or irreligion. The students numbered about 50 or 60, but rose to 170, from various classes of life, among whom were three or four Indians, whom the habits of the place, however, did not suit, for they soon absconded. The Bishop did not take a very prominent part in the instruction, this being done by Professors: his own occupation, and also the beginning of many troubles, is told us as follows:—

'It is possible to conceive the existence of a community, like that at Kenyon College, living in the midst of the woods in the simplicity of primitive Christianity, gladly submitting to the paternal sway of their Bishop, from a principle of obedience to lawful authority, controlling alike the teachers and the taught. But though an interesting place, Gambier was not a perfect Utopia. The Bishop was sometimes engaged at a distance visiting his diocese, or, more frequently, in collecting funds in the Eastern States. Generally, when at home, he was engrossed in his building operations, and in the care of the College estate. He rose at three o'clock every morning, wrote his letters, and spent his time till night in superintending

the masons, carpenters, and ploughmen. The Professors (or Faculty, as they were termed) formed a body by themselves, and though generally clergymen, they were republicans, and were averse to be controlled by the mere will of the Bishop in his episcopal capacity. The students, too, had, of course, imbibed republicanism with their earliest ideas, and were by no means inclined to submit to the bare exercise of power in any shape. Yet they were not a disorderly body. They were largely endowed with that capacity for self-government which is so prominent a feature in the American character. And it was through this channel that the influence of the Bishop, or of the Professors, was usually brought to bear upon them. Thus, for example, it was desired that an extensive garden should be formed, partly for ornament, but principally to supply the common table with vegetables. Accordingly, a few of the more influential students were called together, and the advantage of forming a "Horticultural Society" was represented to them.—Pp. 39, 40.

Our author's life at Gambier was generally a studious one, but his vacations were varied by expeditions or even long journeys. During his first winter he undertook the distribution of Bibles. As might be expected in such an incipient state of society as surrounded him, he met with adventures in this work:—

'I rode forward, and about dark came to a farmhouse, where I was well received by the proprietor, one Joseph Denman, who told me that he had fought with the British at the Revolution, and also in the late war. Hearing that a singing-school was to assemble in a neighbouring log-house, I went there with Denman's son, and remained a long time, while about sixty persons, chiefly Baptists, were taking their lessons. After all was over, I explained to them my object in visiting their township, which they approved of, but said that their school district had already been supplied with Bibles by the Baptists and Methodists. In this respect I afterwards found their information not altogether correct. I returned and slept at Denman's.

'In the morning, the old man desired me to show him a copy of the Constitution of our Bible Society. When he saw that the Bishop was *ex-officio* its president, he grew quite furious, and swore that the Bishop wanted to make himself a king, or at least to introduce English power into Knox County. He stated his firm conviction that the College was designed for an English fort, and that the massive nature of its walls could be accounted for only on this supposition. He asserted that the Bishop's object in going to England was, that he might make his own arrangements with the despotic government of that country. He declared that it was impossible that the English should have sent such vast sums to assist the Bishop without a sinister motive, and concluded by charging me with being a spy in the service of the British government, as well as an emissary hired by the Bishop, to make proselytes to his new religion. I bore this storm with as much composure as possible, and when it ceased, I asked the old man to let me know how much I owed him for my lodging, supper, and breakfast, all of which had been very comfortable. He declined taking any compensation; so I thanked him for his hospitality, and departed.'—Pp. 46, 47.

Other good offices were undertaken nearer to the College, of which the following is an example:—

'After a slight breakfast on Sunday mornings, we left the College at seven o'clock, crossed Vernon River in a boat, which I had constructed for

the purpose, and, by the aid of my pocket-compass, proceeded through the woods about six or seven miles towards the south-west. The tall straight trees around us consisted of oak, hickory, sugar-maple, sycamore, walnut, poplar, and chestnut, and the wild vine often hung over our heads in graceful festoons. Occasionally we heard the notes of singing-birds; but far less frequently than in England. Deep silence generally prevailed, and prepared the mind for serious reflection. Here and there we passed a recent clearing, on which the gigantic trees were still standing, but deadened by the operation of *girdling*. Now and then we climbed over a rude fence constructed of rails split by the axe, and piled up in a zigzag form, without any nails or other fastenings. Sometimes we called at log-houses to lend religious books, or to receive them when read. Sometimes we found people ready to assist us by lending a horse to facilitate our locomotion. At the end of our journey we arrived at a small village, or rather a collection of log huts, the scene of our labours. We entered the school-house, a rough log building, with a huge chimney at one end, and a fire-place extending across one side of the apartment. Soon the children came flocking from the cabins and through the woods, accompanied by their parents and many other grown people. In a short time the room was filled, and a number of persons were often obliged to stand outside for want of accommodation. As the people were full of sectarian prejudices, though few of them were actually members of any denomination of religionists, we were obliged to proceed with great caution. One of us, for example, gave out a hymn from the American Prayer-Book, reading two lines at a time, which the whole assembly joined in singing. All then knelt down to prayer, when a large portion of the Church Service was repeated from *memory*, since "praying by a book" would in the first instance appear a kind of abomination. After prayer, a lesson from the Old Testament was read and explained as clearly and familiarly as was possible to us. The elder part of the assembly then dispersed for an hour or two, while the children were instructed in reading the Scriptures. All came together again afterwards, when a lesson from the New Testament was read and explained, and a few words of exhortation were added, concluding with some Collects recited by memory, and a parting hymn. We always found the people hospitable and anxious to entertain us as well as possible. Their prejudices generally died away very rapidly, before long the Prayer-Book was introduced without offence, and a decided improvement in religion and morals was perceptible. Such services as the above were of course far from strictly regular, in a canonical sense; but the Bishop encouraged them on account of what he deemed the urgency of the case, and because in several neighbourhoods they constituted the sole means (in any shape) of public worship and religious instruction.'—P. 58—60.

Once a year the Annual Convention of the diocese assembled at Gambier, when about twenty clergy and thirty or forty lay delegates attended. All were guests of the Bishop, and dined at the common table, with the students, on most simple fare. Opposite principles, however, were at work in these gatherings, and we have disclosed to us, in the painful history of Bishop Chase's resignation of the Ohio diocese, some of the evils and dangers which have to be encountered in Synodical action, as in every other active and living element in the business of this world. The Professors of the College were inclined to very low views of the Church, while the Bishop rested his prerogative on the Apostolical succession, and was moreover blamed for

taking to himself too arbitrary a control of secular matters connected with the College, as well as ecclesiastical in the diocese. Wherever there is life we are sure to meet with many characteristic peculiarities, and therefore we must not be too severe on some intolerance of actively employed power among American Professors and Clergy. The habits and feelings of a new republic made them sensitively jealous of individual freedom and impatient of control. We should be sorry, however, to trouble our readers with the details of this dispute. The Bishop resigned, and his resignation was accepted by the Convention. This seemed a dangerous precedent, and much to the injury of episcopal power; it was therefore some time before the General Convention would sanction the proceeding, and more stringent rules with regard to the resignation of a Bishop have accordingly been enacted.

It was with a bitter pang that he left Gambier, and retired to a farm belonging to his niece at no great distance. This new residence, as if to add to his feeling of desolation, was miserably out of repair, so much so, that he had to procure the assistance of some neighbours, before he could patch up the log-house to be proof against the weather.

* But such a situation could only be regarded as a temporary retreat. In the year 1832 the Bishop purchased an extensive estate in a beautiful prairie country near the river St. Joseph, in Michigan, 300 miles to the westward. Though the war with the Indian Black Hawk was raging in the neighbourhood, Bishop Chase at once commenced the work of cultivating the soil. A stout ploughman went before, turning up the furrows of rich earth, while the Bishop followed with a bag of maize, three or four seeds of which he deposited "every two feet in every third furrow." In this labour, together with that of planting potatoes, he spent most of the day for several weeks, while on Sundays he sought a field of spiritual toil in the settlements ten or twelve miles distant. Having commenced the erection of a dwelling with five rooms, he returned to Ohio, and conveyed his family from the "Valley of Peace" to their new abode, denominated by the Bishop, GILEAD.—P. 320, 321.

In a few years the Bishop grew rich, as our author remarks, after the manner of Job, but he was not long destined to be without a spiritual charge. In 1835 he was invited to assume episcopal jurisdiction in Illinois, which he accepted. Nothing discouraged by the poor return of gratitude which he had received for his efforts in founding Kenyon College, so impressed was he with the necessity of such an institution, in connexion with the Bishop of a diocese, that he forthwith undertook to establish one in Illinois, which now is in work under the name of Jubilee College. In the General Convention of 1850, he was the presiding Bishop of the American Church, and though much exhausted by age and infirmity, he still remains a bright example of apostolic life, as of the apostolic office.

In 1831, Mr. Caswall was admitted into deacons' orders, and undertook the charge of a congregation at Portsmouth, on the Ohio. His going to this place is made the occasion of introducing a most interesting account of a lay member of the Church, by whose long-continued exertions that congregation has been founded and maintained. Mr. Gunn is said to be a fair specimen of many laymen in America, as zealous and indefatigable in the cause of their Church. We will not spoil the interest of this history, by extracting only part, and the whole is too long; we therefore pass it over, and will confine ourselves more immediately to our author's personal observations. An insight into his proceedings at Portsmouth we may give in the following passage:—

'From this period Portsmouth began to improve rapidly. On the 30th of December we made our final arrangements for building our Church; we decided upon our plan, appointed a building committee, and engaged the workmen. About the same date our new Bishop, Dr. McIlvaine, visited Portsmouth for the first time. He preached a very eloquent sermon on the evening of his arrival, and a large congregation was collected at an hour's notice, notwithstanding the deep mud in the streets, and the dreadful state of the weather. The next morning, at nine o'clock, there was another service, and, after a second eloquent sermon, I had the pleasure of presenting to the Bishop five grown persons for Confirmation. One of these had been a Romanist, one a Baptist, one a Methodist, and the other two had been educated in the Church. The Lord's Supper was administered by the Bishop to a large number of communicants, all of whom seemed deeply affected on this interesting occasion.

'Not long afterwards we laid the first stone of our little church. The dimensions were to be forty-seven feet by thirty-four, and the material was to be chiefly brick. It was also determined that the seats should be *open* and free to all. This building was consecrated in the course of 1833; and the good Mr. Gunn's wishes were thus accomplished within a year after his death. The congregation soon filled it; they added a gallery and an organ, and in the course of a very few years a parsonage house was built by them, and annexed to the Church. One end of the sacred edifice was then removed, and a great addition made to it in length. A further enlargement afterwards increased its breadth, and, within the last few years, the parishioners have removed it entirely, and erected in its place a capacious church in an ecclesiastical style of architecture, capable of accommodating 600 or 800 persons.'—Pp. 163, 164.

From ill health Mr. Caswall was compelled to leave Portsmouth, and after a journey of 1,290 miles, he settled at Andover College, in New England, sixteen miles from the sea, where he was principally engaged in study, having the use of an extensive library in that institution. The position of the place is thus described:—

'Andover is one of those pretty villages, for which the states of New England are distinguished. From the Seminary, which occupies a very lofty position, there is an extensive prospect of a cultivated country, with blue mountains in the north and west, from fifty to eighty miles distant.

At one point in the neighbourhood I was able to count the towers of more than twenty of the old Puritan meeting-houses, which in the distance reminded me of the village churches of England.'—P. 175.

The friends and supporters of the Church in America are not confined to clergy and laymen, examples of whose zeal we have already witnessed, but laywomen there, as elsewhere, are to be found in her foremost ranks:—

'Leaving Salem, I proceeded four miles to Marblehead, another venerable town, standing on a rocky promontory projecting into the Atlantic Ocean. Here I found an Episcopal Church, built in the form of a cross, and about a hundred and twenty years old. The congregation had been reduced very low, most of its *male* members having deserted it or died. Under these discouraging circumstances the ladies remained steadfast, and these unflinching daughters of the Church had for some time supplied the offices of *wardens* and *vestry* from among themselves. Their perseverance was rewarded by final success, and at the time of my visit they had relinquished their official position in favour of the other sex. In the course of three years, under the care of an energetic Rector, this parish numbered seventy-four communicants, and a hundred and twenty-one Sunday scholars.'—P. 181.

The subsequent experience of our author was chiefly connected with places of education, the pastoral office not, however, being neglected. In 1834 he was appointed professor of sacred literature at a college near Lexington in Kentucky; in 1838 he removed to Canada, near the Falls of Niagara; and in 1841 he was appointed theological professor in Kemper, near S. Louis, in the Missouri. It is more to our purpose, however, to examine his observations, as they bear on general questions, than to give the details of his transatlantic residence, though we cannot but call attention, by way of a little variety, to his experience of some warlike proceedings during his residence on the borders of Canada. A band of American sympathisers had taken possession of a mill on the Canadian side of the water, anticipating a large reinforcement from the rebels. The conclusion of this proceeding is thus described:—

'About three in the afternoon the militia marched out and surrounded the redoubtable mill, in order to prevent the escape of its inmates by land. The great guns also, drawn by six horses each, rolled out of the town an hour afterwards, and the regulars who accompanied them took their position on a rising ground within half a mile of the tower. Three steamers and two gun-boats were stationed on the opposite side of the enemy, who were thus completely hemmed in by an overwhelming force both by land and by water. The vessels on the river first commenced their ineffectual fire, and, as they dropped down the stream to avoid the shots of the 18-pounders, some of their little balls ploughed up the ground within a few yards of the spot where I was engaged in conversation with the rector of Prescott. But when the 18-pounders were brought to bear on the tower, it soon appeared that they were discharged to some purpose; and the stone walls, strong as they were, began to exhibit indications of an approaching collapse. Such of the balls as missed their aim, struck the surface of the river, and danced over the water for about a mile, to the American shore,

where they created great alarm among the multitudes who had assembled as spectators. The brigands fired very few shots in return, and were soon dislodged from their strong position. The troops now advanced rapidly, and opened a smart fire of musketry upon the enemy, which was promptly returned. At length they succeeded in setting fire to all the buildings around the mill, and as it was now dark the flames showed the position of the combatants, and produced an awfully sublime effect. The enemy had now been driven again within the tower, when, finding their condition desperate, many of them surrendered at discretion. Some had been burnt to death in the buildings; others were found up to their chins in the water; and Von Schultz himself was discovered in a thicket while endeavouring to escape. The prisoners were chiefly American citizens, and nearly every one of them had been provided with a rifle, a brace of pistols, a bowie knife, and an abundance of ammunition. A large supply of arms, 150 kegs of powder, three cannon, and a quantity of provisions, were also captured.'—Pp. 240—242.

It is difficult to compare the educational system of the American Church with our own. The circumstances which surround our universities and public schools give them a prominence, as national establishments, which it would be contrary to the genius of the American people to establish among themselves. With us, moreover, they are the inheritance of a former age, and derive their dignity and importance from the theory of a much more extended churchmanship than at present prevails.

It is the exclusive privilege of a people united in religion to found educational institutions that sink deep into the national character; whereas, schism and disunion naturally prevent any efforts after largeness and nobility of design from having more than very partial results. We could not refound Oxford or Eton, for we possess in them some of the peculiar advantages which arise from a position of the Church that has long passed away. The present generation has tried to establish great colleges, and is aiming at grand schemes of education, for which we may fairly wish success, though convinced that in the present divided state of religion, it must after all be an irregular scrambling work, individuals and parties doing the best they can for themselves under a variety of conflicting circumstances. We are far from saying that we ought, perforce, to go back again to a time when toleration-acts were unknown, and every good subject was supposed also to be a churchman. We must rather take facts as they are, and aim at consistency in what plainly is the spirit of the day. If the Church has lost one kind of advantage, viz.—that of a universal acknowledgment of her spiritual character as a component part of our national constitution; let her be careful not to be hampered with its difficulties; but rather enjoy another kind of privilege, viz.—that freedom and toleration of self-government which are supposed to be the features of the present time.

We only, however, introduce this reflection to prevent any

disappointment in reviewing the educational plans of the American Church. We must not take credit to ourselves, as if we had established those at home, of which we are so justly proud. Religion altogether in America is so dissolved into its chymical elements, that cooperation, or any extensive union, for purposes of education, otherwise than entirely without any notice of religion, is quite impossible. In some States public money is voted in this way for secular education, but if we may believe our author, without any very great success.

'The common schools throughout the United States are designed to convey instruction at least in reading, writing, grammar, geography, and arithmetic. The Bible or the New Testament is, in many cases, used as a school-book; but, as a general rule, any definite system of religious teaching would be regarded as *sectarian*, and would not be tolerated. Yet, even under this disadvantage, conscientious teachers sometimes succeed in forming (with Divine help) devotional and moral habits in the minds of their youthful charge. The principles of republican society are not favourable to reverent and implicit obedience on the part of pupils, and "moral suasion" is deemed the "more excellent way." It is stated in a late American paper that the proportion of those who cannot read and write has greatly increased during the last ten years, and the same authority asserts that, in one of the Western States, out of a population of a million, there are 175,017 persons, over 21 years of age, in that unhappy predicament.'—Pp. 199, 200.

It necessarily follows, from this state of things, that church-schools and colleges are, strictly speaking, in a sectarian position, deriving no numerical strength from the wide and inclusive character of an established Church. Yet, if we take into account these circumstances, the comparatively small sect which the Church as yet is, and the very recent period from which we may date her free and active life, it is most encouraging to find that so many colleges and schools are busy in carrying on the work of education in an ecclesiastical spirit. It is a sign that the Church is being founded on true and permanent principles; and if the number of students is not yet large in some of them, the machinery is being perfected, the roots are gaining hold of the soil, and the plants will doubtless grow up with health and vigour. There are, in the United States, 121 colleges, 42 of which are theological seminaries, 8 of them under the control of the Church, with others more or less under its influence. Besides these, there are many schools, often in connexion with colleges, both together being under the superintendence of the Bishop, as in New Jersey, where the zealous and indefatigable Bishop Doane has illustrated the strength which such an arrangement can afford to the Church, in a manner that claims the true gratitude of all churchmen. We cannot better describe Burlington College and S. Mary's Hall, as these two institutions are called, than by laying before our readers a paper, or a

letter, addressed to the *Churchman Newspaper*, with reference to the design of the former, and a short extract from a farewell address from the Bishop to the scholars of the latter, at the end of a half-year's labour.

'What was the Bishop's wish? What his proposed design? To found an institution for the Church and of the Church. This was a bold effort; its Trustees must needs be members of the "Protestant Episcopal Church." True to the Church, and to the truth as it is witnessed by the Church, there could be no catering for favours out of the Church. "BURLINGTON COLLEGE IS A CHURCH INSTITUTION," was inscribed upon its banner. "Holy Scripture will be daily read. Holy prayer will be daily offered." It was "the conception of one, who felt himself to be a debtor to the Cross, for infinitely more than all that he can do, or be." Let the Bishop speak for himself:

"As that without which all the rest were vain, it is our design, at Burlington College, to bring up Christians. The word of God is daily read, at morning and evening. At morning, at noon, and at evening, we kneel in daily prayers. The precept of the Wise Man is continually obeyed, 'Catechise a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.' The means of grace are constantly employed. The hope of glory is steadfastly proposed. The pastoral feet are constantly in motion in our sacred fold. The pastoral eye is constantly alert, to watch and guard our lambs. We have set the Cross before us, as the magnet of our souls. We bend before the Holy One, who died upon it, to beseech Him that He will draw us by it to Himself." These were not mere words of promise; held out, to ask for favour, and suffered to pass away, in sound. They have been verified in a careful and patient observation of the Church's order for daily services; and in the Church's counsel for the maintenance of her holy discipline.'

At S. Mary's Hall, the Bishop thus affectionately speaks to his scholars:—

'Farewell. Go in the good path, faithfully. Duty is unity. It seeks one end. It seeks it in one way. The end, the way, God's will. As one, as He is. Hence, the necessity of firmness, in adhering to the good choice made at first. And in this, dear children, lies your greatest difficulty. It has been your happiness, that you were helped in the good choice. You were born of Christian parents. In holy baptism, they early made you Christians. They took you to the Church of Christ while your feet tottered yet, and your tongues lisped. They had you taught your duty, in the blessed Catechism. They kept you at the feet of Christian Pastors, as the lambs of Christ. They brought you to this Christian fold. For months and years they kept you in its gracious shelter, and beneath its sacred shadow. If your hearts have not resisted heavenly grace, and rejected holy opportunities, and hardened themselves against all good influences, you are in the good path. Your eyes have learned to know it. Your feet have learned to walk in it. Your hearts have learned to love it. Is it so? Dear children of my love, lambs of my Saviour's flock, baptized and bathed in His most precious blood, is it, is it so? The trial, if it is, is to begin to-day. From this day, new temptations will beset you. From this day, new hindrances will befall you. From this day, new dangers will surround you. Can you hold fast "the beginning of your confidence?" Can you say to Satan, "Get behind me?" Can you say to the world, I am crucified to you with Christ? Can you say to the flesh, Be subdued and subjected to the Spirit? "To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." To go in the good path; to go on in it faithfully and constantly unto the

end; this, my beloved children, is your duty and your difficulty: and this is what I mean, when I say to you, Farewell.'

The plan of study in an American college, is generally very ambitious; more so than can seem practicable to ourselves; which is explained by Mr. Caswall as follows:—

'The English reader will be inclined to marvel at the considerable amount of nominal study required in order to fit a young American for holy orders. But, until very recently, a habit of *thoroughness* has not been deemed essential to scholarship. The mind has been cultivated very much as the ground is tilled by the settler in the back-woods. In the fields of Indiana, or Arkansas, the traveller will, of course, miss the smooth pastures, the trim hedges, and the level corn-fields of English agriculture. He will see the plough winding its way among enormous stumps, and sometimes barely scraping the ground, on account of the roots which still remain below the surface. Here and there he will find that the settler has not even taken the trouble to fell the trees, but has been satisfied for the present with killing them, by cutting through the bark. And round the whole estate, perhaps, there runs a rude fence, constructed partly of rails, and partly of fallen trees. Yet, amidst all this rough and superficial work, a crop will ripen on the productive soil more abundant than the spectator would have considered possible. This is a fair type of American Collegiate Education in general, as compared with that of the Universities of Europe, although of course there are exceptions. It has been considered, that a moderate acquaintance with a variety of subjects has answered a better practical end, in the circumstances of the country, than habits of profound thought and patient investigation. But a demand for a higher order of education has commenced, which will unquestionably lead to a more scientific system of mental culture, and, before many years, we may hope than an English scholar will have no further occasion to smile at the peculiar concords, or the grotesque prosody of the western student.'

—Pp. 203, 204.

The General Theological Seminary at New York is for the purpose of study after the ordinary collegiate course is expired, and a large proportion of the whole body of clergy have been members of it. Its influence has invariably been of a high-church character, and therefore it is not universally popular. The unhappy affair also of Bishop Onderdonk has been the occasion of a considerable falling off in its members of late years. We must now, however, pass over from the subject of education to other topics.

There is no part of the American Church system which must, at the present time, engage the attention of ourselves with the same interest as its Synodical action. If we have given episcopacy to a sister church, we shall receive good interest for our gift if we, in return, gain from her some help towards re-establishing among ourselves that necessary element of church government, signified by the term Synod, with its various derivatives. It will be an overwhelming testimony to the reality of these two elements of church government, if the same generation of men may see England and America first giving practical acknowledgment that episcopacy is a Catholic element

of the Church, tied by no national accidents or customs; and then showing the fruits of that mutual sympathy, by the one, who received the first gift, making such good use of it, as to bring into active power, and clearly to mark with the Catholic stamp, the dormant principle of Convocation, and thus to afford an irresistible argument in aid of those who are struggling in England for the same privilege.

The republican theory of government, as worked out in the United States, has at least had this advantage, that it has shed a certain very useful gleam of light on the Church, which the old Tory notions of Church and King very much obscured. We yield to none in loyalty, nor do we forget that kings have been the Church's nursing-fathers and queens her nursing-mothers, when, humanly speaking, she had but little other help; as Churchmen we bear immortal gratitude to a chivalrous age of kings, who in their day moulded the standard of the world's nobility so far after the Church's laws, as to have left behind them, even to this day, a faint tradition which cannot well be shaken off, even by those who would,—that the highest gifts of humanity, the most excellent parts of our race, the gentlest feelings of mutual intercourse, the truest courtesy of general bearing, the noblest courage of mind, the grandest efforts of Christian charity, and the most steady development of intellectual culture, are all, in some mysterious way, connected with the Church; yet for all this we cannot but feel that a certain use has been made of loyalty, by its public administrators for some generations, which is oppressive and injurious to the Church. So far also as this has been too unfair a test, imposed on the loyalty of those who really begin to feel what the Church is, we hold that, according to the natural retribution of the order of things, a republican theory has it in its power to show forth a certain phase of truth which that system of Church and King has kept out of sight. This is far from saying that we would choose the republican system for the Church's welfare in preference to our constitutional theory; we are only drawing a particular conclusion from a particular view of the question, and not striking a general balance, such as is supposed to be the ground of an abstract choice. Moreover, it is not our place to select forms of government; we only take them as facts, and then compare their details. We shall presently show that the republican theory presents great obstacles to the Church's more perfect working, and in fact, that her system naturally tends to the paternal exercise of royal functions; but, nevertheless, if we feel the constitutional liberty of the Church to be under a disadvantage in our own case, we have a perfect right to agitate for the engrafting into our Church's practical working,

so much of her developed position under a republican government, as we have good grounds for thinking is her right, and is for her ultimate advantage in the free exercise of her spiritual office. America seems to supply that experience which is needful to back up our home claims, and prevent them assuming too visionary and unreal a character; and therefore it is that we look with such peculiar interest to a book like Mr. Caswall's, containing his careful experience and watchful powers of observation throughout a number of years, in the great variety of positions which he occupied within that Church, such as were capable of showing to him her daily work from one end to the other of her constitution.

Nor can it be brought as a charge against this picture of the Church's constitution in America, that it is made too perfect, is too one-sided, or savours too much of that kind of testimony which betrays the party advocate. We have real life given to ecclesiastical self-government in the United States, by its abuses, its unpleasant features, its tendency to encourage self-conceit and pomposity in ill-regulated minds, and occasionally by its acts of cruelty, as well as in its obvious power to build up the Church, as a working vigorous institution, on a solid foundation. Some of the evils, however, are plainly attributable to the unwillingness of a portion of the Church to accept in its true character those episcopal functions for the exercise of which, as a body, she so long and urgently petitioned; and others are simply those manifestations of the defects in the national character which active work of any kind is sure to bring out to the surface.

For any complete idea of the constitution and standing of the American Church, with a view to understanding the functions and powers of its synodal action, we must refer to our author's own account, mere extracts from which would be to little purpose. A brief summary, however, sufficient to explain the main difference of position between a Church that is established, and one that rests entirely on her own internal management, may perhaps be given in very few words.

In the first place, what we call a parish, which has definite legal boundaries, does not exist, with the exception of some remnants of an original division of that kind in the south. For this, therefore, we must in our minds substitute the idea of a congregation, beyond the limits of which the clergyman has no more pastoral charge than in a missionary character. By this, however, we are not to understand a fluctuating number of individuals, who form part of this congregation or not, by the simple fact of being inside or outside certain doors. A parish in America,—for the name is still preserved, as if by a traditional right on the Church's part to have territorial demarca-

tions, even if they cannot literally be effected,—consists of a congregation of people, who associate together for common religious objects, and accept the rules fixed upon by Diocesan authority, their mutual relations within themselves being generally secured, on all points involving property or secular rights, by an act of incorporation, easily obtained from the legislature, whereby the parish becomes in the eye of the law a corporate body, in the same manner as a railway company. The body thus constituted meet together and are accepted by the Diocesan authorities as forming part of the Church, on its undertaking to conform with its rules in doctrine and discipline, and to carry out its appointed method of regulating their internal affairs. A name is agreed to, similar to the designations of our own parishes, and a vestry appointed, consisting of about twelve members with two wardens. The powers of the wardens and vestry include the appointment of the so-called rector, and it fixes his salary, derived from pew-rents or voluntary offerings, as the case may be; there being also a process of induction by which, when performed, it is understood that the connexion is not to be severed unless for weighty reasons. The rector presides at vestry meetings; and the respective duties of himself, of the wardens, and vestrymen, are sufficiently obvious to allow us to pass on to the next stage, viz. the diocesan authority. This consists, in the first place, of a Bishop, who acts as president, and then of the clergy canonically resident in the diocese, with lay deputies from each parish or congregation. Once a year these meet together and form the Diocesan Convention. There is some variety in the constitution of their power, dependent often on whether the popular element or the episcopal had priority of position on the ground. Generally, however, their power may be stated as wholly legislative, and confined to matters which affect that diocese alone, and not others in common with itself. It is altogether subject, on larger questions, to the General Convention. On the vacancy of the bishopric, it nominates, but the general convention must ratify the appointment. The clergy and laity commonly vote together, but may do so separately if demanded.

The General Convention meets once in three years, and has supreme power in all matters that affect the whole Church in union with it. The Upper House consists of bishops, and the Lower of clerical and lay representatives, four of each being sent by each diocese. This house, therefore, at present numbers 256, the two elements, lay and cleric, often voting separately, as in the Diocesan Convention. The powers of the General Convention are described by our author at some length, after which he sums up in the following words:—

'The English reader will perhaps find it difficult to dissociate this statement of *powers*, and the definition of powers, from some ideas of an authority proceeding, in the first instance at least, from the State, and enabling the Convention to act in the mode described above. But history will show that no such authority has been either desired or accepted in the American Church. The essential authority of the Church, as existing in the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, has been found, in practice, abundantly adequate to the direction and limitation of its own energies. Civil legislation would add but little, if anything, to the weight of the American Canons, whether General or Diocesan. At all events, the members of the Church in the United States are convinced that legislative interference on the part of their several governments would be an incalculable injury, and that the civil authority needs the protection of religion far more than religion requires the assistance of the State.

'The Canons have not been framed according to any preconceived ideal of a perfect system, but have been enacted, repealed, modified, or enlarged, as circumstances have required. Hence they are comprised within a small space; they are simple, practical, easily understood, and intended to be observed. There may still be many defects in them; but the harassing question can never occur as to which of them are binding, or which *obsolete*. And it is found that a general conformity to these Canons is secured by the force of public opinion and ecclesiastical feeling in the members of the Church, both lay and clerical.'—Pp. 114, 115.

Here, then, we have a system of church government created by the actual needs of churchmen, without any peculiar predilection for ecclesiastical theories of mediæval date. On the contrary, it is opposed to them in some of its details, and, therefore, may be fairly claimed as the natural and spontaneous growth of the Church in America, left free to her own devices, and dependent on her own resources. Now, if we perceive that this natural form of church government corresponds with the theory of our Church, and of the whole Church Catholic, we have a right, in the first place, to claim that theory as not wholly out of date, not a mediæval folly, not impracticable in an enlightened age, not inconsistent with the 19th century. But how does the system we have been calling attention to correspond with the theory of our own Church? The General Convention is the exact antitype of the two houses of Convocation, with but one exception, that we shall presently notice. The Bishop of Exeter has proved our Church, also, to have the power of assembling in Diocesan Synod, and the parochial system corresponds very nearly with our own. For certain religious functions, therefore, we find American churchmen adopting a plan, which people in England have long possessed in theory, but which they suppose to be now defunct in many of its parts. But it may be said that such a plan in a non-established church is obvious, and plain enough, but that there is all the difference among ourselves. Now the amalgamation of two powers must always be on equable terms, and must not deprive either of what, in the nature of things, is in its own

peculiar province. The one may have power within the other, by mutual agreement, or rather by a kind of solution, the one into the other, but each one must still do the description of work peculiar to itself. The union of Church and State is of this kind. If primarily a certain kind of government is essential to the Church's well-being, and is a part of her very nature, a union with the State on such terms as would deprive her of it is unfair. The example of America, according as it does, in main points, with the whole Catholic theory, is convincing proof that such is the government of the Church, and, therefore, that nothing else can properly be so; and, therefore, as a final conclusion, that if practically we find our own Church not so governed, we have a right to claim a re-adjustment of power. Nor is it a slight consideration in our own favour, that the Church has never formally sanctioned any terms of agreement with the State that deprive her of Convocation as her chief power in spiritual things. She has indeed acknowledged the State as supreme, not only in temporal matters generally, but also in her own, thereby differing from the freedom of the American Church, as she does from a private corporation among ourselves; but, as the natural balance against this, in the division of work, the Church exercises spiritual power, not only over herself, or rather not only over her members in their individual capacity, but over the State as such, for the crown itself is conferred by the Church, and on certain ecclesiastical conditions.

The difference, therefore, between the position of a church established and non-established is not in essentials of her government, as we have reason to conclude Convocation to be, but only in a differently adjusted balance of labour and privileges. There is, however, one difference between what we have endeavoured to show is the natural and essential government of a free church in the present day, and the theory of our own, which may at first seem an objection to our whole argument. This is, the important lay voice in all synods, which has been already referred to. But the Church never did dispense really with the influence of her lay members; for although Convocation among ourselves is altogether clerical, it is because the civil parliament is, or was supposed to be Christian, and was acknowledged as having a general, though external power over all the proceedings of the clergy. The lay element, therefore, in our legal constitution, was only transferred from Convocation to an acknowledged external influence, and not annulled. Or even if we go further back to feudal time, before the exact adjustment of rights on either side, which our constitution in theory possesses, we shall find that, without any very willing reception may be of lay influence, yet the violent self-will of the barons was so far

acknowledged as a fact, that it entered into all Church counsels ; and it was only from the necessity of assuming a defensive attitude, that the Church, in common with every institution, and almost every individual of the times spoken of, apparently made her counsels exclusive. Even social intercourse was carried on with arms all ready to check encroaching violence ; and men lived in defended castles, though not liable to the charge of being unnaturally misanthropic or exclusive. In the still earlier ages of the Church, it is unnecessary that we should here prove, how willing the authority of kings and emperors was respected as the lay voice in ecclesiastical arrangement. The only difference, therefore, between the synodical action of early time, and as now developed in America and in other churches, is in the quarter whence lay influence is received, whether, according to the regal or imperial notion, from a king or emperor, as guiding paternally or commanding the voice of the people ; or whether, according to the republican theory, from the actual presence of individual laymen, representing others and having a voice in the government of their own order. The difference is, whether lay influence is received from above or below. In whatever way the secular government is managed, we may be sure that according to the same principle will the voice of laymen be heard in Church counsels. If that government be one of violence, it will be by violence that the Church is made to hear ; if it be one of well-ordered royalty, the king will be the Church's father ; if it be one of popular representation, by the same principle will the laity of the Church possess their share of power. In all cases the Church's own essential rule remains the same, so long as she takes care that the distinctly clerical office be not overpowered by the voice of the laity, from whatever quarter it comes ; and also the fact remains the same that, if the Church cares about her work and feels what she is, there are actual synods and convocations held, that men do really meet together to consult on Church questions, be they lay or clerics, and that an external power is not accepted as the supreme authority in her spiritual office.

It would be beyond our present object to make these remarks bear in any general way upon the attempted revival of our own Convocation, but we must point out one or two considerations with reference to it, even if we would understand the nature of the lesson we might derive from our American sister. We have only dealt with the non-establishment of the American Church as a fact, and drawn certain conclusions from a state of things which actually exist beyond our control. The premises, however, being different in this country, the conclusion we must also expect to be different. A certain degree of caution, there-

fore, is most necessary in taking for granted that laymen must at once form part of our Convocation. The fact among ourselves is, that we are an established Church; and an intimate union between Church and State is so obviously good in itself, that we would not willingly wish this fact to be altered. Meanwhile we must deal with it as a fact, whether we wish it otherwise or no. Surely, then, in an established church it is most natural that the lay influences should be through the ordinary voice of the country in its secular government. Mutual relations are already established, therefore it is more consistent that whilst they continue to exist, they should be the channel of mutual influence on each other's counsels. But suppose that our Church were at once to admit lay representatives into her synods, in any plan of reformation, which, in itself, all must agree in thinking is most necessary, what would be the consequence? The laity would be represented twice over, through the civil legislature, and also through the deputies present in synod. We see then a reason why the laity ought to be represented in American and also we would say in Scottish church counsels; but we also see that the same result as a whole may be best effected among ourselves by their exclusion. The power of the Crown over the Church is quite sufficient lay influence at present, and unless that is curtailed it would be rash, for the sake of popularity, to admit the same kind of influence under another form also. There is one view of the case, however, which it would require a volume to work out, and which we must therefore leave our readers to adopt for themselves. Between, on the one hand, the entire freedom and non-interference upon religious subjects, which is the policy of the civil government in the United States, and on the other hand, that consistent union between Church and State, which is the original theory of our constitution, there may be degrees and shades of difference in practice, which naturally demand concessions proportioned to them. Even in the altered circumstances of the Church within the bounds of England itself, arising from the policy of the State, there may be such an approach toward severing some bonds of the union between these two powers, as will require some modifications in the representative system of the Church to correspond with it; but in the colonies this applies with peculiar force, since the home government stands in a very different position with the offshoots of the Church in the many branches of our colonial empire, to what is the case in the mother country; a difference well and indignantly illustrated by Mr. Caswall's chapter on the Canadian Church, as well as by what we have already seen to have been the case in America before the establishment of the republic.

With a short passage, however, from Mr. Caswall on what we have just said, we will pass on to his general remarks on the whole subject of synodical action. We need not trouble our readers with the detail of the grievance contained under the subject of 'Clergy Reserves;' but the general impression of our author is thus stated with regard to the treatment of the Church by the civil power. He begins thus:—

'Among the agencies which have contributed to preserve the generous spirit of loyalty in Canada, the Church must undoubtedly be reckoned the principal. And yet it is remarkable that the Church has met with a degree of opposition and even cruelty on the part of the secular authorities, both Imperial and Colonial, which appears the result not so much of a shallow political expediency as of absolute infatuation. In the provinces now forming the United States, the Church was indeed neglected by the British Government, and forbidden to complete her necessary organization. But in Upper Canada she has been stripped of endowments which a republican government would have respected, and at the same time prevented from acting in her own behalf, as an independent body deriving no appreciable benefit from union with the State.'—Pp. 246, 247.

And after stating some particulars, he sums up as follows:—

'It was in consequence of this monstrous combination that the Church lost her University. King's College, as the institution was formerly called, once enjoyed a religious and ecclesiastical character, and from its central situation at Toronto, as well as from other advantages, was well adapted to diffuse a salutary influence. But after the union with Romish Lower Canada was effected, an Act was passed, suppressing King's College, excluding from the University established in its stead all religious instruction whatever, and prohibiting any form of prayer, and every act of public worship within its walls. The Church now requested separate schools for the religious education of her own children, but her prayer was rejected by the votes of Romanists, who, however, managed to secure the very same privileges for themselves.

'From the above statement, it will appear that, although the Canadian Church has suffered bitter opposition as a "State Establishment," and a "Dominant Sect," the State has been, in reality, one of the most powerful enemies with whom she has had to contend. And the severity of this opposition has been aggravated by the very loyalty of the Church, which has made her fear, lest, in defending herself against State aggression, she should endanger the principle of British connexion, and, with it, the very foundations of society.'—Pp. 250, 251.

A somewhat longer extract will be necessary from our author's fair and impartial remarks on the subject of Synods, or we cannot do justice to the prominence given to it in his book. The following passage we commend to the earnest consideration of all Churchmen:—

'Although, in a perfectly united church, Synodical action might be an unmixed benefit, it is very certain that where divisions on matters of principle exist, it does not accomplish so much as sanguine persons might anticipate. Hence in times of controversial excitement, American churchmen look forward to the meetings of their Conventions with anxious apprehension, and regard them as a subject of earnest prayer and suppli-

cation to the Almighty. They know how difficult it is, especially in Diocesan assemblies, to rise above mere local feelings and party prejudices. They are aware that, under such impulses, these Conventions have sometimes committed themselves to a course of action afterwards bitterly regretted. They know also that even the General Convention has not been wholly free from similar dangers, and that great wisdom and forbearance on the part of leading men is often necessary to avert the disastrous effects of faction. At the same time they are fully alive to the value of their Conventional system, knowing how infinitely superior it is to ecclesiastical anarchy, or to Anti-Church legislation on the part of the State. They know that this system simplifies and economises their means, and combines their energies, with a view to definite results. Though harsh sounds occasionally proceed from the machine, they hear in those sounds little but the escape through the regular safety-valve of a power which otherwise might produce a destructive explosion.

‘Hence it seems to follow that Synodical action on a grand scale, excluding as much as possible merely local and temporary influences, might prove highly beneficial to the whole Church, and at the same time might relieve minor ecclesiastical legislatures from many of the difficulties under which, at present, they are labouring. Could we, for example, suppose the existence of a system of united operation, including both England and America within its sphere, it is quite conceivable that great advantages to each country would be the result. We should not be so much in danger of “measuring ourselves by ourselves, and comparing ourselves among ourselves.” Each portion of the Church might supply to the other many of the very elements of which it is particularly in need. It cannot be doubted that various causes, historical and otherwise, retard the advancement of the Church of England, which might be more clearly manifested to us by the unbiassed discrimination of our western brethren. On the other hand, we might contribute our part in elevating their standard of judgment on various important points of doctrine and of practice. We might increase their feelings of reverence and respect for antiquity, and in return receive from them a portion of their elasticity, their perseverance, and their energy.

‘Measures are now on foot, or partly accomplished, which render it unnecessary to construct a grand scheme of Synodical action by efforts of mere imagination. There exists already the cluster of American dioceses bound together for the last seventy years by the General Convention. Synodical action has commenced, as we have seen, in Canada, under a Bishop, who in his last Charge has expressed an anticipation of a second cluster of dioceses united in a General Synod of British North America. The Australian prelates have made a commencement, which will probably eventuate in a third cluster of extensive dioceses, represented in an Australian Convocation. New Zealand has addressed its noble-minded Bishop on the subject of a General Convention of the Clergy and the Laity residing in that Britain of the Pacific. The Mother Church in England has witnessed earnest and faithful efforts, which may terminate in the establishment of Diocesan Synods, and the revival of the ancient Ecclesiastical Legislature. And to crown the climax of accomplished and anticipated results, the able Bishop of Vermont, in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, has thus expressed himself in regard to the consolidating measure of a Synod of all our Bishops of Great Britain, America, and the Colonies:—

“I fervently hope that the time may come when we shall meet together in the good old fashion of Synodical action. How natural and how reasonable would it seem to be, if ‘in a time of controversy and division’ there should be a council of all the Bishops in communion with your Grace. And would not such an assemblage exhibit the most solemn, and,

under God, the most influential aspect of *strength* and *unity*, in maintaining the true Gospel. It is my own firm belief that such a measure would be productive of immense advantage, and would exercise a moral influence far beyond that of any secular legislation."

"An Anglo-Saxon Synod, like that proposed above, might settle many important questions connected with the promotion of Christianity, and the definition of the doctrines of the Reformation. It could not, indeed, unsettle what General Councils have already lawfully determined; and, however respectable in moral weight, it would be far from possessing the attribute of infallibility. But its members might pray earnestly for Divine assistance, and might consult with learned and grave deliberation. They might devise measures for adapting the Church to its enlarged sphere, by neutralizing as much as possible the causes of weakness and corruption. They might diminish the extent of division by deciding upon many of those subjects which now constitute the rallying points of opposing parties. They might supplant heresy and imposture by drawing forth the divine character of the Church in active and beneficent exercise. They might utter a united voice in behalf of all who are oppressed—they might ascertain the causes which debase and demoralize the poor—they might lay plans for elevating the lower classes generally in the scale of humanity. They might teach the Church how to shake off whatever is effete or unreal, and to become an unworldly and peculiar society. They might display the glory of the divine hierarchy of the Christian Religion, by casting to the winds the false dignity of the world, and going forth, as many of their number have already done, in the faith and devotion of primitive times.

"Then it would be seen that a great and truly Catholic Church can exist and prosper without a Roman Pontiff, without the abuse of images, without fictitious miracles, and without Mariolatry. Then it would appear that neither the local influence of Rome, or of England, or of America, is essential to the efficiency of that spiritual society, which is built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. The same Episcopate to which in the beginning the work of diffusing Christianity was committed, and on which the gracious promises of the Redeemer were conferred, would show itself as the great bond of union, and the main foundation of ecclesiastical strength."—Pp. 392—396.

It is not our purpose, in these pages, to write a homily, addressed to the Low Church portion of American Churchmen; but we cannot but express regret at some great deficiencies in the Church's practical system, the reformation of which, by the distinctively Church movement of late years, still meets with opposition. The republican spirit of the people is allowed to interfere too much with the reverence and obedience essentially due to the episcopal office, as also it requires the clergy generally to make too large sacrifices of their personal independence, in subservience to the popular will. It is, for instance, with a hope of better feeling and better discipline, in time to come, that we read of the surplice being occasionally given up to the wishes of the congregation, and the Church's ritual and rubrics being so freely altered according to individual tastes. Some things, which seem strange to us, may no doubt be attributed to the long withholding of Bishops from among

them, such as the disregard of consecrated ground, the common uses to which churches are applied, and the neglect of proper reverence to the dead; but bishops have now been enjoyed long enough to make the neglect of these observances no longer so excusable, especially where the prejudice against them is not observed to be wearing away with the removal of their first cause. The alterations also in the Prayer-book, which are sanctioned by General Convention, are a subject of regret, in many respects, without at all calling in question its general power to adapt for themselves the service used in a distant church. But on these things we have not space or inclination to dwell. They form subjects of party feeling in a sister-church, with which we have no concern in detail, except so far as the controversies of the American Church sympathise very closely with our own, and that therefore men of each side look for help and sympathy across the Atlantic. Yet, one object of the independence of local churches would be defeated, if party spirit was allowed to spread beyond the bounds of each church; if members of one church were to join in a controversy with the other, about questions which only concern local interests or proprieties. We would therefore be very general in the profession of common cause, and our offers of sympathy with any portion of the Church to the exclusion of others. It would, however, be unreal to disguise the mutual help and strength which the High Church movement, on either side the Atlantic, looks for and gratefully receives from the other. In propagating the broad truths of the universal Church, and in the endeavour to give life to her catholic system, there is no need to be restrained by deference to any local independence. These are subjects about which men of all nations may feel and act alike, and for the furtherance of which, according to their own convictions, men are at liberty to join in close alliance, without any aggression on mutual rights or mutual courtesies; we may therefore openly avow our anxious watching over the success of those Churchmen in America who, in no small strength of zeal, whatever their numbers may be, are striving, by precept and example, to raise the tone of feeling and improve the ecclesiastical arrangements of their Church. Some time back there were seven churches in New York, the centre of the High Church movement, where the Church's daily prayers were offered up, in some cases with considerable care of ritual observance. The proper architectural arrangements of a church are extending far and wide, education prospers, as we have seen, and every means is actively employed for teaching the principles of the Church. The newspapers, for instance, enlisted in the cause, exhibit a freedom, and sometimes, we may say, a prolixity of discussion which is truly

characteristic of the people, but which, nevertheless, we must hail with joy as doing the Church's work and spreading her views, according to the usual methods by which the national habits require that men should form their views. The national character of the American people affords also considerable help in carrying out some of the Church's most cherished principles; and as we have touched on some of the evils of the republican temper, we will also quote Mr. Caswall's testimony as to its advantages.

'Yet if republicanism has its dangerous tendencies, it possesses also its favourable and salutary influences. The practical and business habits of the Clergy and Laity in their Conventions may be traced to this source. There is much in the general *equality* of the people which renders an American parish an encouraging sphere of clerical labour. The prevailing freedom from poverty, as well as from great wealth, removes many temptations to vice, while an almost universal competence promotes intelligence, encourages marriage, and otherwise assists in producing a wholesome state of society. The parishioners possess habits of co-operation, and can assemble together to promote common objects without fearing the loss of dignity from contact with inferiors. And, for the same reason, all of the juvenile members of the flock can be collected in the same Church schools under the care of their common pastor. The people generally, too, are able to comprehend discourses on difficult points of theology or morals, and can appreciate, intellectually, the historical and other arguments by which the cause of the Church is sustained.'—Pp. 286, 287.

The general respect and kindness shown toward the Clergy, as a body, must also be reckoned among the strong points of their position in extending the Church's influence. Of this, our author says as follows:—

'Before, however, we bestow our commiseration on the American Clergy, it may be well to recollect that a large share of worldly *comfort* is an exception to the general experience of the ministers of the Christian Church. Many things which would be a sore mortification to an English Rector, are comparatively unheeded by an elastic American, accustomed to enterprise from his youth, and habituated to the ascendancy of the multitude. If circumstances require him to change his place of abode, like other inhabitants of new countries, he will suffer little from the severance of local attachments. Should he meet with peculiar difficulties in one field of labour, there are many vacant parishes open to him in which he may receive greater encouragement. Small as his income may be, he is not expected to give largely to the poor; for usually the poor, as a considerable class, are not to be found. He pays no direct taxes worth mentioning, and no poor-rates whatever. He is rather the recipient than the dispenser of temporal benefits, while, at the same time, he possesses a few sources of encouragement, already specified, which are not open to the great body of the English Clergy. His exertions will not generally continue long without producing some corresponding result, and if he be moderately faithful to his charge, his heart will soon be gladdened by an enlarging flock, and an increasing number of communicants.

'Many pleasing tokens of respect and kindness are bestowed upon the Clergy, not only by the members of their own congregation, but by comparative strangers. Medical men and lawyers seldom charge them for their

professional services. Sometimes a clergyman receives a wagon load of substantial comforts, such as two or three barrels of flour, a dozen bushels of apples, a barrel of cider, and a sack of coffee. Not unfrequently he is presented with a new silk gown, or even a complete suit of clerical apparel. I have known a Clergyman to receive several fees for marriage of a hundred dollars each, and similar presents at baptisms and funerals. The Missionary Bishops have been conveyed thousands of miles by steamers on the western rivers without expense to themselves. A Clergyman on his way to California was sent free of charge, and in the best style, by the owners of the steamer *Crescent City*, from New York to Chagres. I have myself experienced similar civilities while travelling on the Ohio Canal; and in hotels I have had the amount of my bill presented to me as a token of respect for the clerical character. Some congregations have paid the expenses of their pastor while travelling for many months in search of health. Within the last year, a congregation in Connecticut presented their respected minister with a purse of 300 guineas, to enable him to enjoy the rare gratification of an extensive tour in Europe, including a visit to the Great Exhibition. In fact, those who are conscious of spiritual advantages derived from the Christian ministry, are not generally slow to exhibit manifest tokens of their gratitude.—Pp. 302—304.

It is impossible that we can conclude our article in more appropriate words than those with which Mr. Caswall ends his book. Expressing, therefore, our truest sympathies with the Churchmen of America, and our best thanks to Mr. Caswall for the useful office he has so nobly taken upon himself, viz. that of promoting, by personal exertions of no mean kind, the mutual intercourse of the two Churches, and their mutual acquaintance with each other, we conclude in his own words:—

‘In times of progress not to advance is to recede. The hope of the Church is in going forwards, in “lengthening her cords and strengthening her stakes.” Let her labour to place herself right in all questions affecting truth and duty, the interests of humanity, and the promotion of the Divine Glory. Let her address herself to her great work with the help of the new race of faithful sons, now rising up, to meet the varied exigencies of the times. Let her gather up all the zeal, and activity, and learning, and piety, and reverence, and kindness, and love of truth, now existing in her scattered members. Let her seek earnestly for the gifts of strength and wisdom from above, and for the pervading inspiration of that Comforter, without whom she cannot continue in safety. Then, we may trust, that in prophetic language, she will arise and shine, the Lord shall arise upon her, and His glory shall be seen upon her. The Gentiles shall come to her light, and kings to the brightness of her rising.’—Pp. 397, 398.

ART. III.—*De Immaculato B. V. Mariæ conceptu, an dogmatico decreto definiri possit. Disquisitio Theologica* JOANNIS PERRONE, *e Soc. Jes. in Coll. Rom. Theol. Prof.* Avenione: 1848.

LONG and strenuous had been the efforts of the Ultramontane party in the Church of Rome to obtain a formal Papal edict, which should decide that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary is the voice of Scripture and the Church, and enforce the celebration of the festival in consequence; and numerous are the works in which the question is discussed, and such a decision recommended. Walchius, indeed, says of them, ‘Si quis singulos adcurate recensere velit, ‘facili negotio integrum volumen de illis, veluti bibliothecam ‘conficere possit.’ Of these, one of the most able and candid heads our present article. The author’s object is to decide whether or not the doctrine in question has sufficient support in Holy Scripture and Ecclesiastical History to justify the Pope in dogmatically defining it to be an article of the Catholic faith.

But the obscurity and confusion in which the whole question is involved is so great as to make it well nigh hopeless to think of arriving at any clear idea of what, if any such there be, is the real doctrine of the Church of Rome on the subject; for so many minute questions have been raised, and so many subtle distinctions laid down on almost every branch of it, that her doctors have never been able to frame any one statement which should be, even to their own minds, in harmony with the teaching of Holy Scripture, and self-consistent: they are at issue among themselves as to its very first principles and most elementary questions. And hence, among other points on which an authoritative decision is called for, it will be necessary for us to inquire, first, what is the real meaning to be attached to the term ‘Conception’ itself, which, strange as it may appear, has never yet been decided, and about which there are many and grave disputes;—and, secondly, what is, after all, the real object of the festival.

1. Gonzalez of Santalla, in Spain, a Jesuit of the end of the seventeenth century, divides the act into three parts:—1. The material, which precedes the *infusio animæ*;—2. The natural, when the *infusio animæ* is superadded;—3. The spiritual, which is caused by the *infusio sanctificationis*, at the first instant of the animation. But Perrone, with the more modern writers, allows of two parts only, the *conceptio activa*, and *conceptio passiva*; the former, as defined by Benedict XIV., consisting merely of the ‘*corporis formatio, organizatio et dispositio (opere*

‘maritali) ad recipiendam animam rationalem a Deo infunden-
 ‘dam;’ the latter, of the ‘rationalis animæ cum corpore copu-
 ‘latio, quæ fit illo ipso instanti quo rationalis anima, corpori,
 ‘omnibus membris ac suis organis constanti, unitur.’ And to
 account for, and excuse the difference of conclusions between
 S. Bernard, S. Thomas Aquinas, with the whole of the medi-
 æval Church of Rome, and themselves, it is the custom of the
 latter to assume that the former received the word *conceptio* in
 the partial or imperfect sense of the mere ‘formatio fœtus ante
 animationem,’ as they state it to be used in Genesis xvi. 4, and
 2 Sam. xi. 5; whilst they themselves take it in its full and proper
 meaning. Cajetan, however, asserts, and undoubtedly with truth,
 that the ancients, as well as the moderns, are to be understood of
 the whole thing complete and perfect; and it is evidently a pure
 assumption on the part of the moderns, for which they offer no
 shadow of reason or proof, to lay down the distinction they do
 in the Biblical cases alluded to. But it is plain that, whilst
 mere assertions are allowed to stand in the place of proofs, and as
 long as such oppositions and contradictions exist amongst them-
 selves, there can be no certainty to which of her contending
 Doctors and Popes we are to look for the final decision of the
 difficulties of the case; at least, the above distinction is plainly
 built upon a purely arbitrary assumption, supported by no word
 of Revelation, and by no physiological knowledge—on a subject,
 too, on which the Church is necessarily incompetent, from the
 nature of the case, to issue any authoritative decision. If,
 indeed, it proves anything, it proves too much; for if S. Bernard
 and the mediæval doctors allude to one part of the Conception,
 and not the other, their testimony can be of no value whatever,
 and it is useless for Perrone, or any one else, to appeal to it; in
 fact, the moderns are evidently attempting to reduce certain
 unknown physical phenomena within the law of an arbitrary
 Ecclesiastical doctrine which has gradually been constructed by
 themselves.

2. It has next been questioned by some of the most eminent
 of the Romish Doctors, whether the Church celebrates on the
 8th of December, the day dedicated to this festival, the Concep-
 tion itself of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or only the Sanctification,
 which they maintain to have been infused immediately after it.
 S. Thomas Aquinas, and the Church in his time, decidedly held
 the latter;¹ but this opinion, though confessed to be not only

¹ We may be pardoned for offering to our readers a specimen of the manner in
 which a Romish controversialist allows himself to speak on a subject, the truth or
 falsehood of which being absolute, cannot possibly depend on any accidental ques-
 tion of time, or on the dictum of any individual Pope. ‘Although S. Thomas, and
 others of the ancients who wrote before Sixtus IV., offered this explanation of the
 festival of the Conception, piously and praiseworthy enough, it cannot be endured

allowable, but even meritorious, before the Bull of Sixtus IV. in 1481, is condemned as utterly inexcusable, 'now that that document has laid it down, that the object of the festival is 'not the *conceptio spiritualis*, but *naturalis*;' an assertion made by Sixtus with the utmost confidence, but which it is not for us to reconcile with the fact, that a century or more after his time, the word *Sanctificatio* occupied in the office of the festival of the Conception the place of *Conceptio*, the former term having been thrust out to make room for the latter by Pope Gregory in the beginning of the seventeenth century: whilst in the ancient statutes of the Carthusians 'De rebus Sacris,' made and allowed in the thirteenth century, we find these words—'In festo de Conceptione Beatae Virginis Mariæ dicatur, loco conceptionis, sanctificationis.'—*Maillon Annal. Appendix, Vol. vi. p. 687, No. 45.*

The fact is, that Sixtus IV. issued bulls, the foundation of others in after times, in favour of a doctrine clearly opposed to that, not only of the greatest Doctors of his Church, but, as we shall presently show, of more than one of his predecessors in the chair of S. Peter; it is therefore impossible, even on Perrone's own principles, that such a rule can have any real claim to the authority which he would demand for it.

3. Again, it has been doubted by Bandell, Master General of the order of Preachers in the beginning of the sixteenth century, firstly, whether the festival of the 8th of December refers to any Immaculateness at, or immediately after, the Conception, and not rather to the sanctity which was undoubtedly conferred upon the Blessed Virgin Mary after the Annunciation, and when she was overshadowed by the Holy Ghost; and, secondly, whether anything more is intended to be commemorated than that she was, through the birth of Christ, to be, as the office expresses it, 'the source of rejoicing to all the world,' of which, as the first fruit, her Conception was made an object of especial observance; an opinion to which even Bellarmine gives his approbation, saying, in his book 'De Cultu Sanctorum,'—'The foundation of this festival was 'not the Immaculate Conception, but merely the Conception of 'her who should be the Mother of God; for whatever were that 'Conception itself, in respect that it was the Conception of the 'Mother of God, the memory of it causes a singular rejoicing 'to the world; for then we first had a certain pledge of redemp-

now that the Roman Church has openly declared that she celebrates, as holy, the formal and perfect Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the moment of her animation. The case, however, of those who wrote before, and after Sixtus IV. is different . . . for it was the endeavour of all the ancient Doctors to persuade the people that the Church, on the 8th of December, did not celebrate the carnal Conception which took place on that day, but the spiritual, when grace was infused into her, either at the first moment of her conception, or subsequently.'—Gonzalez of Santalla, sect. vii. p. 51. 4to, Dillingæ: 1690.

'tion, especially since she was conceived, not without a miracle, 'from a sterile mother. Hence, even they who hold the Blessed Virgin Mary to have been conceived in sin, celebrate this 'festival.'—Book iii. chap. 16.

The fact is, that the Church of Rome has no one doctrine of paramount authority on the subject: thus we find her at two different periods of her history holding two different fundamental doctrines, each of which has been received as the truth, and supported by Papal authority; yet as they are distinguished from one another not by any mere verbal refinements or distinctions, but by a difference of essential and germinal ideas, it is impossible in any manner to reconcile them together, and in consequence their respective maintainers cannot avoid opposing and contradicting one another. One dates from and supports itself by S. Bernard, and the other is that in favour of which Perrone has composed his disquisition. The former teaches that the Blessed Virgin Mary was freed from sin by infusion of grace *after* her Conception, and so that she was, as S. Bernard urges, like Jeremiah and John the Baptist, 'sanctificata in utero,' having been for a point of time under the bond of original sin; the latter, that she was conceived immaculate, being in fact not 'sanctificata' but 'sancta,' and therefore that there never was even a moment of time when she was not holy; in which case, as S. Thomas Aquinas urges, she could have had no need whatever of redemption.¹

The Church of Spain, which, as is well known, stood foremost in the twelfth and following centuries as the champion of the cause, adopted the former theory, holding in common with all the mediævalist Doctors, after S. Bernard, much as follows: that the Blessed Virgin Mary at the first moment of her existence needed redemption, and was in some degree under the contagion of original sin, in which therefore she could rightly be said to have been conceived, as being an offspring of Adam, and naturally born of parents, themselves lying under the penalties of his first transgression. Hence for that point of time, however long or short, she stood in need, like all other merely human creatures, of sanctifying grace; but this grace was communicated to her 'in utero,' in such a degree as to free her from all taint of original sin, and to make her what cooperating Grace ever after—

¹ Gonzalez says that the asserters of the 'pia sententia,' or Romish doctrine—that is, as it was known in his day—affirm her not only 'debitum habuisse contrahendi maculam originale cum fuit in lumbis parentum atque etiam in sui conceptione, sed etiam in ipso primo instante animationis.' (P. 118.) And Launoy tells us that it was the original tradition of the Church of Rome that Mary was for a brief 'morula' under sin, because, according to all, as soon as she could be sanctified she was sanctified, and in consequence that Christ alone was conceived without all sin.

wards continued her, a fitting temple for Him, the only sinless One. But it would probably be difficult to find a more remarkable illustration of the words of Suarez than in this controversy. 'Quod uno tempore est probabile,' (that is as far as the Church of Rome is concerned,) 'decursu temporis potest improbabile fieri.' Perrone now rejects the opinion of his own Doctors, exceeding as it does, and not falling short of the voice of Holy Scripture and the early Church on the subject,—both of which teach her to be one who, though blessed among women, is still essentially a merely human creature, and as such subject to the laws of the rest of her kind,—as little better than what he terms the 'impia sententia of the enemy,' and thereby, as far as in him lies, consigns them—S. Bernard, S. Peter Lombard, S. Thomas Aquinas, S. Bonaventura, and others of the like exalted stamp, both of moral and intellectual character—to utter condemnation. His own system is based on a determined denial that there ever was so much as a single moment of time in which the Blessed Virgin Mary lay under any taint of original sin whatever. He will not allow a 'liberatio,' but he claims for her an 'exemptio.' He requires an absolute freedom from all sin, not by purification after, but by perfection before her Conception, and he creates in consequence a spotlessness which does not admit, as it does not require, any cleansing whatever; but, with all his learning and ability, he entirely fails in showing (as might indeed have been expected) that this is anything more at most than the opinion of a very small portion of the doctors of the Church of Rome. In discussing the question as we propose to do, we shall first endeavour to give a brief sketch of the history of the doctrine, and then examine how far it is in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture, with those systems and historical assertions of antiquity which bear upon the subject, and, lastly, with the voice of the Church of Rome herself, as declared not only by those of her writers whose names carry with them the greatest weight and authority, but even by the authoritative and explicit declarations of former Popes.

The first cause of the question being raised was, as Perrone rightly says, the conduct of the Canons of Lyons, who, about the year 1140, adopted the festival of the Immaculate Conception, which had lately been introduced into some of the Churches of France.¹ S. Bernard remonstrated with them in a letter in

¹ It is doubtful, says Perrone, whence the doctrine first originated, or how it came into France. He thinks that it was originally derived from the East, and was celebrated at Naples in the ninth century, 300 years before S. Bernard; but, as he observes, the language of S. Bernard is against this view, since he describes it as a 'nova celebritas quam ritus Ecclesiasticus nescit . . . et non commendat antiqua traditio . . .' 'Some writers,' he says, 'have ascribed its origin to France, and even to England, in the latter case deriving it' (but erroneously) 'from

which, having expressed his wonder that the Church of Lyons, the first in the country both in position and authority, should be willing to forfeit its good name by introducing a new 'celebritas' of which Ecclesiastical 'ritus' knows nothing, which reason does not approve, nor ancient tradition recommend,' he proceeds: 'Most firmly do I hold with the Church, "eam in utero accepisse ut sancta prodiret."'" He then compares her with Jeremiah: 'Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee;' and with S. John the Baptist: 'He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb;' and he continues:—

'The Mother of God also was, without doubt, Sanctified before she was born, nor is the holy Church in error in accounting the day of her Nativity holy; I think that even a more abundant blessing of Sanctification descended on her, which not only Sanctified her birth, but also preserved her life from all sin, which happened to none other of the children of men. It was becoming, indeed, that the Queen of Virgins should pass her life in the privilege of a singular Sanctity, and free from all sin, who, in bearing the Destroyer of all sin and death, obtained for all the gift of life.

'Whence, then, is the Sanctity of her Conception? Can she be said to have been prevented by Sanctification, as being already holy when conceived, and thus her Conception itself was also holy? But she could not be holy before she existed, as she existed not before she was conceived. Or, again, did Holiness attach to her conception, "inter amplexus maritales," so that she was, at the same time, both sanctified and conceived? But reason admits not this; for how can there be Holiness without the Holy Spirit to sanctify, or how could there be any union between the Holy Spirit and sin? or, again, how was there not sin where there was concupiscence? unless it be said, indeed, that she also was conceived of the Holy Ghost and not of a human father, which is hitherto unheard of. I affirm that the Blessed Virgin conceived, and not that she also was conceived by a virgin; otherwise where is her prerogative as the Mother of God, by which she alone is believed to exult both in the gift of an offspring and in the spotlessness of her body, if you ascribe the same to her mother also? This is not to increase, but to detract from her honour.

'If, then, she could neither be sanctified before her Conception, since she did not then exist, nor in it, on account of the sin which was inherent in the act, it remains to be believed that she received Sanctification whilst

S. Anselm.' Bulæus, in his History of the School of Paris, tells us that the Church of Lyons began the festival from no Papal authority, but because they affirmed themselves to be in possession of a document from Heaven directing its observance, 'Scriptum aliquod cœlitus delapsum in quo Beata Virgo Maria mandabat placere sibi festum illud celebrari.'—Tom. ii. p. 135.

¹ The Benedictines truly observe on this, that S. Bernard admits no difference between Jeremiah, S. John, and the Blessed Virgin Mary, except that he allows her to have had a more abundant share of grace than they. 'In utero,' they say, 'sanctificatos affirmat omnes, immunem a culpa originali nullum.' In fact so far is S. Bernard from falling short of true Catholic language on the subject, though differing essentially from modern Rome, that he speaks much more highly of the sanctity of the Blessed Virgin Mary than the early Fathers would bear him out in doing. 'Ante sancta quam nata,' 'benedictio . . . quæ . . . vitam ab omni . . . peccato custodiret immunem,' are modern doctrines, and we may thus perceive that the more moderate of the two phases of the Romish system dates from him, and is supported by the great authority of his name.

yet existing in her mother's womb, which, excluding sin, made her nativity holy, but not her Conception also. Wherefore, although it is granted to a few among the sons of men to be born in Holiness, it is not also granted them to be conceived holy; and thus to one alone would be reserved the prerogative of a holy Conception, even to Him who should sanctify all men, coming, alone of all, without sin, to make a cleansing of sins. Our Lord Jesus Christ, then, alone, was conceived of the Holy Ghost, who was alone holy even before His conception; He only excepted, to all the other offspring of Adam apply the words spoken by one in humility and truth of himself—"I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."

'Since this is so,' he concludes, 'what reason can be given for the festival of the Conception? In what manner. I say, is a Conception asserted to be holy which is not of the Holy Ghost,—not to say which is of sin; or will that be accounted a festival which is not holy? The Blessed Virgin Mary will gladly forego a distinction by which either sin shall receive honour, or a false sanctity appear to be introduced.'

We have dwelt the longer on this letter, not only as it is that to which the mediæval writers are accustomed to appeal in support of the doctrine, which they also hold, of a *sanctificatio in utero*, and which they trace back to this document as the original cause of its introduction into the Church, but because the force of the negative and destructive arguments contained in it, together with its author's well-known ability and sanctity, as well as his great authority as a Canonized Saint of his Church, form the chief reason why the more extravagant opinion, held by Perrone in the present day, and foreshadowed in the times of S. Bernard, did not long ago pass, by Papal rule, into a formal article of the faith of the Church of Rome, as it is assuredly the source to which those of that Church who would base their faith on some foundation more sure than the mere dictum of a single Pope, must now look for a continuation of that toleration which former Pontiffs have been ready, and even eager to extend to the original and really Catholic doctrine, which knows no essential difference between the Blessed Virgin Mary and other merely human creatures, and of which, in consequence, Perrone cannot now venture openly to recommend the withdrawal.

After, we should rather say contemporary with, S. Bernard, was the well-known Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, who lays down, in the 3d book of the 'Sentences,' a doctrine which, as we shall shortly see, agrees in all essential particulars with that of S. Bernard, and which was followed by those writers who employed themselves—chiefly in the thirteenth century—in commenting on that work; among whom we meet the illustrious names of Alexander of Hales, our own countryman, Albertus Magnus, S. Thomas Aquinas, his pupil, and S. Bonaventura.

A century and a half later, the festival of the Immaculate Conception was observed in the Oratory of the Roman Church, in the presence of the College of Cardinals, and by the efforts of

Nicolas III., or, as some say, of Clement V., his successor;¹ an example which was followed by several of the religious orders,—the Benedictines, the Cistercians, the Cœlestines (a branch of the Benedictines), the Carmelites, the Trinitarians, the Redemptionists, and others. From this time began those contentions between the rival orders of S. Dominic and S. Francis, which are so closely connected with the question at issue; the former, as a whole, upholding the doctrine of S. Thomas Aquinas, and the latter taking the part, as they suppose, of J. D. Scotus. The agitation was kept alive by John de Montesono, a Spaniard of the order of Preachers, and a Doctor of Paris, who in the year of 1387 delivered, at that city, certain theses, or propositions, in one of which he affirmed that it was as contrary to Scripture to say that any one man was exempt from original sin, except Christ only, as to say that ten were so; or to assert that the Blessed Virgin Mary was not conceived in it, as to say, ‘*illam fuisse beatam et viatricem ab instanti suæ conceptionis vel sanctificationis, vel fuisse unitam hypostatice*’ (*sic*). For this the faculty of Paris passed a censure on him, which was confirmed by the Antipope, Clement VII., to whom he appealed at Avignon, and by Urban VI., to whom he next carried the cause, at Rome, and he himself, as it appears, was imprisoned. As an instance of the principles of Montesonus’ opponents of the Ultramontanist party, we may perhaps be allowed to offer the following extract from Alexander Natalis:—‘*Montesonus had affirmed, in his 9th Proposition, that “to assert any thing as true which is contrary to Scripture, is most expressly against the faith.” This was condemned as false, and injurious to the Saints and Doctors; and rightly so, said Peter de Alliaco, one of his opponents, and afterwards bishop of Camerara and Cardinal; because there are many contradictory propositions to be found disputed among them, of which some are against Scripture, but none expressly opposed to the faith.*’

The Council of Basle was held in the year 1439. In its 36th session it decreed that the assertion ‘*gloriosam Dei genitricem Mariam, præveniente et operante Divini Numinis gratia singulari, nunquam actualiter subjacuisse originali peccato, sed immunem fuisse semper ab omni originali et actuali culpa, sanctamque et immaculatam, tanquam piam, et consonam cultui Ecclesiastico, fidei Catholicæ, rectæ rationi, et sacræ Scripturæ; et ab omnibus Catholicis approbandam fore et amplectendam.*’ But, as Perrone confesses, the Council, even when using such strong language as this, carefully abstained from declaring it to be a positive article of faith.

¹ Perrone, p. 30.

² Alex. Natalis, History, thirteenth Century, vol. xx. p. 505.

From this decree, however, and not, as some say, from a disputation of J. Duns Scotus, the University of Paris adopted the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and forced it upon its members,—‘That we may see,’ they say, ‘the holy decree of the Council approved by the judgment, consent, and reverence, of all the Churches, and of the whole Christian people, we cannot but wonder at the vain pride, and rash and insane obstinacy of some . . . who, in our time, hesitate not to oppose or call in question the holy and religious doctrine of this Universal Council and the Church, which, according to Christ’s promise, cannot err.’ They then proceed to order, first, that no one be henceforth enrolled a member of their University, who will not undertake to advance the doctrine with ‘all his powers;’ and, secondly, that any one already belonging to it, who ‘in contempt, not only of the University, but of the Council and the Church, whose authority is supreme, shall venture to uphold the opposite one, shall be deprived of all his honours, and cast out of its society as an ethnic and publican.’¹ If we are not surprised to find the Gallican Church so strongly supporting a Council, one of whose acts was to depose the dominant Pope, yet it is at least singular that Perrone, an Italian and a follower of Ignatius Loyola, should appeal to its authority, and that when he does not hesitate to term ‘it ἀκέφαλος et schismatica.’ It is instructive to glance at the list of names given by Launoy, whom the above decree declared to be, in fact, heretical. It contains, amongst others, those of two Popes, Clement VI. and Innocent V., as well as S. Peter Lombard, S. Thomas Aquinas, S. Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, and others.

It was nearly forty years later that Sixtus IV. issued his celebrated Constitutions, the first of which only causing fresh disturbances, necessitated the publication of a second, to explain and support it, and put an end to the growing scandals and offences. It condemns and excommunicates both those who assert and those who deny that the holders of the Immaculate Conception are guilty of heresy—‘cum nondum sit a Romana Ecclesia et Apostolica sede decisum.’ It was these Constitutions, which, as might be expected, were far from finally settling the question, that the Council of Trent directed to be observed and republished: it being, as we learn from Palavicini, through the exertions of the Dominicans, supported by the bishops of Spain, that the strenuous efforts of Cardinal Pacecho to have the doctrine finally decided, or at least acknowledged with favour by the majority of the Council, were finally overruled, and a declaration, signifying their desire to leave the whole question open,

¹ Alex. Natalis, vol. xx. p. 587, &c.

drawn up and affixed to the decree 'De originali Peccato.' It runs thus:—'Declarat tamen hæc sancta synodus non esse suæ intentionis, comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem, Matrem, Dei generatricem, sed observandas esse constitutiones felicitis recordationis Sixti Papæ IV., sub pœnis in eis constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat.' The case then, in the Council, stood much as Gonzalez describes it: 'It was agreed upon that nothing should be done, by which any cause of strife should be administered to the Catholic party, nor that any term should be introduced, by which anything could be detracted from either side of the question,' so that when the suffrages were taken anew, and the meeting unusually protracted, it came to this point,—that although many considered the Blessed Virgin Mary to have been conceived without sin, an equal number, on the other hand, thought it more expedient to detract nothing from the opposite opinion.'

Pius V. soon after the Council issued a Constitution in which he gave permission for the defence of either side in the dispute, although at the same time he forbade the question to be handled 'in vernacula lingua,' and he finally inserted in the Roman reformed Breviary and Missal an office, 'De Virginis Conceptu,' with a mass to be read on the 8th of December, ordering for the sake of unity both the office and mass for the Nativity to be adapted to the festival of the Conception, with the alteration of the word 'Nativitas' into 'Conceptio.'¹ But not even thus were the divisions and disturbances finally terminated. Paul V., in the year 1616, retraced the steps made in advance by his predecessors, and once more left it open to each party to follow freely its own opinion; and when the kings of Spain, whose dominions were much harassed by the contention, subsequently endeavoured to obtain a final decision on the subject, both he and Gregory XV. his successor. A.D. 1622, contented themselves with imposing silence on those who were inclined to deny the new doctrine;² or, as Mosheim graphically describes it:—

'If the Pontiffs were awed, on the one hand, by the warm remonstrances of the Spanish Court, which favoured the sentiments of the Franciscans, they were restrained, on the other, by the credit and influence of the Dominicans. So that after the most earnest entreaties and importunities, all that could be obtained from the Pontiff by the Court of Spain was a

¹ Perrone, p. 43.

² Gregory XV., according to Gonzalez, brought the Dominicans to the custom of the Church; 'Not,' he says, 'directly obliging them to judge speculatively that the Blessed Virgin Mary was preserved from original sin in her Conception, but compelling them to conform themselves to the practical judgment of the Church in celebrating under that title what she intends to keep, namely, the Conception as immaculate.' (P. 60.) In other words, he required them to keep the festival, but not to believe the doctrine.

declaration, intimating that the opinion of the Franciscans had a high degree of probability on its side, and forbidding the Dominicans to oppose it in a public manner; but this declaration was accompanied by another, by which the Franciscans were prohibited, in their turn, from treating as erroneous the doctrine of the Dominicans.'

It is little to be wondered at that such conduct should have provoked the sarcasm which immediately follows:—

'This pacific accommodation of matters would have been highly laudable in a prince or civil magistrate, who, unacquainted with Theological questions of such an abstruse nature, preferred the tranquillity of his people to the discussion of such an intricate and unimportant point; but whether it was honourable to the Roman Pontiff, who boasts of a divine right to decide all religious controversies, and pretends to a degree of inspiration which places him beyond the possibility of erring, we leave to the consideration of those who have his glory at heart.'—*Century xviii. sect. ii. part i. § 48.*

In the year 1661, however, Alexander VII., at the joint entreaty of the Church and Crown of Spain, issued a Constitution in favour of the doctrine, which Perrone describes as 'vere *sigillum quo superiora decreta omnia obsignavit*,' though he is obliged to admit, '*nec quisquam vere Catholicorum vel hiscere deinceps est ausus, si irreligiosos nonnullos scriptores neotericos excipias, inter quos principem sibi locum vindicat Launoius*,'¹ 'atque in extremis hiscere fere annis Georgius Hermesius.' Still the question was not so finally decided even by this decree but that Clement XI. found it necessary to re-establish the festival in the year 1708; and lastly, Gregory XVI., in the year 1834, at the petition of certain Bishops of the Gallican Church, ordered, 1, that the word 'Immaculata' should be added to the Preface of the Mass of the Conception, celebrated on the second Sunday in

¹ Few, indeed, have been the champions more able to support and make good their cause than Launois, and Perrone seems to feel this, if we may judge from the number of pages, and the amount of labour which he has bestowed, though in vain, to his confutation. Launois does not hesitate to speak most strongly in condemnation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and, to Perrone's great wrath, he reflects severely on the conduct of the Popes in permitting its introduction. 'After Clement VI,' he says, 'the tradition of the Apostolic See was diminished and deformed; for Sixtus IV., a Franciscan, held in equal respect the novel doctrine of Scotus, and the tradition of the Apostolic See and Church of Rome, being persuaded that the latter was no other than the opinion of the Preachers. O impudence! O utter contempt of the Apostolic See and of the Pontiffs his predecessors! For he approved an office of the Conception by one Leonard of Nogaro, which the Church of Rome was unwilling to receive, as appears from a letter on the sacred rites of the Roman Church, which Christopher Marcellus, Archbishop of Ancyra, wrote in the time of Pope Leo X., and dedicated to that Pontiff in the year 1515. In that work the festivals of Mary are marked, namely, the Purification, the Annunciation, the Assumption, and the Birth-day. On the Conception it is wholly silent. This is to be considered as the remains of the tradition of the Church of Rome, which subsequent Popes obscured and destroyed, especially Alexander VII., who, in a decree on this subject, recounts all that Bonaventura and other Doctors objected to him, in favour of the Immaculate Conception. This, I say, he did to show to which side he himself inclined.'—*Præscrip. ix. p. 20.*

Advent, with the grant of a plenary indulgence to such of the faithful as should join in celebrating the festival; ¹ and, 2, that among her other encomia she should be addressed in the Litanies of Loretto, 'Regina sine labe originali concepta;' rules which the present Pope, in the year 1847, confirmed and renewed.²

'Atque hic,' says Perrone, when dismissing this branch of the subject, 'fuit exitus quem hactenus habuit controversaria istæ, quæ a tenuibus exorta principiis, longo seculorum serie post tot contentiones et disceptationes ita progressa est, ut pia sententia magis ac magis in annos invaluerit, donec sola in Ecclesia Catholica sit dominata, atque universali unoque *pene* consensu, excepta fuerit ac propugnata.'—*Perrone*, p. 50.

From the history, we will now turn to the proofs of this doctrine, as offered by the Church of Rome; premising that the whole question being strictly one of *fact*, it is plain that conclusions drawn from mere hypothesis, probability, or conjecture alone, must be wholly insufficient for its establishment, and that in consequence it must be treated historically, and proved, if at all, by plain dogmatic assertions, first—as to the principle, at least, on which it is based—of Holy Scripture; and, secondly, of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church at large. This indeed Perrone admits, when he says, 'Siquidem cum agitur de dogmate agitur de facto: factum autem idoneis tantum testibus, minime vero conjecturis solisve ratiocinationibus est comprobandum.' (*Perrone*, *Procem.* p. xii.) And, I. of the Biblical testimonies, Perrone candidly admits that against it are to be ranked all such inspired assertions as declare, 1, that the original sin of Adam has descended to all his posterity alike; and, 2, that, in consequence of this fact, all without exception stand in need of the redemption of the cross; or, in which, in Perrone's more emphatic words, 'Redemptionis necessitas quoad omnes pariter et singulos, per Christi merita asseritur.'

Under the first class come such assertions as those in Job xiv. 4: 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.' Ps. li. 5: 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin hath my mother conceived me.' Rom. iii. 23: 'For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;' v. 12: 'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.' Ephes. ii. 3: 'Among whom also we all had our conversation in

¹ Cumque in Gallis festum Conceptionis ex præcepti obligatione non celebretur, plurimorum Episcoporum illius regni precibus idem summus Pontifex annuit, ut Dominica secunda Adventus singulis annis Missa de Conceptione una cum adjecta voce "*Immaculata*," in præfatione cani aut legi posset; concessa præterea indulgentia plenaria fidelibus omnibus rite comparatis, qui ad Ecclesiam festi celebrandi causa, se conferrent.'—*Perrone*, p. 49, and see *Appendix*, p. 355.

² Perrone, p. 49, and *Appendices* 1, 2, pp. 354—357, and 385—392.

'times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.' To which it may be surely allowed us to add, that the whole complex of subjective Christianity is so rooted and grounded on the same primary truth, that the failure of it in any one instance would at least go near to render the whole null and void.

A few instances of the second fact may be found in S. Paul's emphatic, and surely final, assertions to the Romans, v. 18: 'Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.' To the Corinthians, I. xv. 22: 'As in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive;' II. v. 15: 'And that he died for *all*.' On which Perrone allows that it is urged, and *à priori* with perfect truth, that as they are universal dicta and admit no exception, it is inferred that the Blessed Virgin Mary is also included in them; otherwise both classes of assertion—viz. that of the universal propagation of original sin in all alike, and of the consequent redemption of all and each alike, 'nutare videntur—ab hoc vero Catholica fides abhorret.' And, he continues, no reason appears why the Blessed Virgin Mary should be exempted 'a labis primogeniæ contagione;' but the same may be urged with equal cogency in the case of others, as S. Bernard argues in his letter to the Canons of Lyons. And thus, an opening once being made, more and more would at length be held to have been free from the same infection. In order therefore to the proof of a true and rightful exemption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, it is by all means necessary that some Biblical assertion, which cannot be thought doubtful, should be brought forward. 'Atqui,' he concludes, 'hic quidem non suppetit, sequitur proinde communi generalique lege Deiparam comprehendendi.' To which we can only say, that if he had produced anything on the other side of the question only half as forcible and really Catholic as this, he would have imparted to our own minds no small portion of that doubt under which he describes himself as having at one period laboured. But the best argument that he is able to bring forward for the Romish system is, that the force of those Scriptural assertions, which apparently tend the other way, has been in fact destroyed by subsequent Papal decrees, and by the rule of the Council of Trent,—an assertion, by the way, in which an authority, such as was expressly repudiated for himself by an inspired Apostle, is glibly and without hesitation claimed for a Pope and a local Council. We may well question what claim a doctrine has to our acceptance which rests on such a foundation as this. Perrone, how-

ever, has done injustice, at least, to the latter of his authorities. The Council of Trent expressly abstained from issuing any decision on the subject, and contented itself with merely affixing to its decree *De originali Peccato*:—‘*Declarat tamen hæc ipsa Sancta Synodus non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Matrem Dei genitricem, sed observandas esse constitutiones felicitis recordationis Sixti Papa IV. sub pœnis in eis constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat.*’ And the authenticity even of this addition has been doubted.¹

On the other side of the question, Perrone at once asserts that the texts ‘quæ in virginei privilegii commendationem a fautoribus congeruntur plura sunt;’ and yet immediately confesses the *πρωτευαγγέλιον* which was spoken to Eve after her fall, to be ‘præcipuum tamen ac vere unicum quod in rem nostram profertur.’ The bearing of it he thus explains: ‘Hoc ipso mulieris victoria in dæmonem prænunciatur, seu in peccatum: porro haud perfecta censeri mulieris victoria posset, si et ipsa aliquando peccato fuisset obnoxia—eo videlicet temporis puncto quo primum fuit concepta.’ Others which might be cited being, he says, applied only in a mystical sense, and deriving their force ‘vel a doctorum expositione vel ex usu Ecclesiæ;’ and, therefore, however little to be rejected ‘a viro Catholico,’ they are ‘minus accommoda’ to the question of how far the doctrine proposed may be ruled dogmatically as an article of the faith.² With such a meagre display of authority from the Old Testament, worse, indeed, it may be thought, than none at all, he offers one more from the New Testament, the angelic salutation to Mary, Luke i. 28. But how the words of that salutation apply to the doctrine in question, he gives us no idea whatever, merely saying that ‘they derive their force from the exposition of the Fathers, and of themselves supply nothing more to its support than mere conjectures.’ Perrone then allows, on the one hand, the assertion, that, to establish the true exemption of the Blessed Virgin Mary from original sin, ‘some Biblical text must be brought forward, the force of which is by no means dubious, but in which such exemption should be plainly expressed,’ (p. 53;) and yet, on the other hand, he has ventured to bring forward only two, neither of which can he pretend to have any direct bearing on the question whatever; so that, by his own admission, the doctrine in question cannot be considered an article of faith necessary to salvation. ‘Innumera prope Sanctorum veterum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum testimonia,’ he says, when addressing himself,

¹ Launoy, Præscription, xi. p. 23.

² Page 74, &c.

after Holy Scripture, to the subject of those of the Fathers who appear to be opposed to his doctrine, 'cum quaestio maxime faveret, prolata in medium sunt, quæ piæ sententiæ adversari omnino viderentur,'—words which he afterwards endeavours to qualify; but, as his efforts are crowned with no manner of success, they must be allowed to retain their first force.

II. Of uninspired authorities Perrone makes five great distinctions, all of which, however, may safely be reduced to two:—1, those who say that our Lord Jesus Christ, and no other, is without all sin; and, 2, those who assert that the whole human race is infected with original sin, *quin Beatam Virginem speciatim nominent*. Under this latter class come those who, as he tells us, say, 'Beatam Matrem sanctificatam mundatam fuisse.'¹ And he certainly furnishes us with some extremely strong and remarkable assertions on this side of the question,—assertions sufficient, we should think, to close it at once to those who had in view the one sole object of the discovery of the truth, and who would prefer the voice of the whole early Church to the rules of individual Popes, even were these so consistent and uniform as they are, in fact, diversified and mutually opposed.

Thus, as to the first class,—to select a few of the most important of his authorities, he refers us, as against his own doctrine, to the words of S. Augustine, 'De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione,' (book ii. chap. 24, § 38; tom. x. p. 61.) 'Solutus ergo ille etiam, homo factus, manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam; nec sumpsit carnem peccati, quamvis de materna carne peccati. Quod enim carnis inde suscepit, id profecto aut suscipiendum mundavit, aut suscipiendo mundavit.' It should be borne in mind that the piece in question was written by S. Augustine expressly to oppose the Pelagian doctrine that there are and would be men who have no sin at all whatever,—'Quod in hac vita sint, et futuri sint homines nullum habentes omnino peccatum,' as the Benedictine preface of the book in question emphatically expresses it. Here, then, if anywhere, we should expect an exception to the rule, did any such, in S. Augustine's opinion, exist,—except only the one so carefully specified. None such, however, is to be found; the whole genius of the piece is opposed to there being any. He does especially except Christ, and Christ *only*. He therefore, by necessity, includes all others, and of course, even the Blessed Virgin Mary among them.

From S. Fulgentius,² 'De Incarnatione,' Perrone next cites the following passage:—

¹ Page 57.

² Cave, Hist. Litt. i. 494. Dupin, vol. v.

'Deus qui venit peccata tollere quia peccatum in eo non est, homo conciperetur atque nasceretur in similitudine carnis peccati, de carne peccati. Caro quippe Mariæ, quæ in iniquitatibus humana fuerit solemnitate concepta, caro fuit utique peccati quæ Filium Dei genuit in similitudine carnis peccati... Si enim caro peccati, non mendaciter dicitur, habet in se caro ipsa peccatum. Si peccatum vero non habet, falsum portat carnis peccati vocabulum. Sed eam de qua loquimur, carnem peccati verax discipulus veritatis Paulus appellat. Restat igitur ut sicut vere caro est cum caro dicitur—ita vere in se peccatum habeat, cum caro peccati ore Apostolico appellatur.'—*Fulgentius*, chap. vi.

'Caro Christi,' says Ferrand, S. Fulgentius's friend and disciple, 'carni Mariæ est similis, et dissimilis; similis quia inde traxit originem, dissimilis quia non inde contraxit vitiatæ originis contagionem.' If in Ferrand's opinion there had been no 'contagio' to contract, Christ could not have been 'dissimilis' in that he did not contract it. We may therefore fairly conclude that the doctrine of Perrone was not that of the Church of Africa in the sixth century. Dupin tells us, moreover, that S. Fulgentius was a careful follower, not only of the matter, but even of the manner of S. Augustine.¹

Perrone observes (p. 85), that among other points in favour of what he terms the 'pia sententia,' are the 'comparisons' made by some of the early Fathers and others between Eve and the Blessed Virgin Mary; 'the one through listening to the serpent having been the origin of sin, the other through faith 'in the message of the angel becoming that of salvation.' 'Quod alligavit Eva virgo per incredulitatem hoc Virgo Maria solvit per fidem,' says S. Irenæus, (lib. iii. cap. 34, p. 262, Grabe;) and again: 'Quemadmodum astrictum est morti genus humanum per Virginem, salvatur per Virginem, æqua lance deposita virginali inobedientia per Virginalē obedientiam,' (bk. v. chap. 19, p. 429;)—and Tertullian: 'In Virginem enim adhuc Evam irrepererat verbum ædificatorium mortis, in Virgine æque introducendum erat Dei Verbum exstinctorium vitæ, ut quod per ejusmodi sexum abierat in perditionem, per eundem sexum redigeretur in salutem. Crediderat Eva serpenti, credidit Maria Gabrieli: quod illa credendo deliquit, hæc credendo delevit,' &c. (De Carne Christi, § 17, p. 321;)—and S. Epiphanius: 'Eve indeed became the cause of death to man, for through her death entered into the world; but Mary was made the cause of life, through whom life was born to us,' (Her. 78, § 18, p. 1051.) We wonder that the real force of these and similar passages has escaped Perrone. Eve and the Blessed Virgin Mary are here, in truth, not compared, but opposed to and contrasted with one another. The former was, by

¹ Cave, Hist. Litt. i. 514. Dupin, vol. v.

original creation, without sin, but, by her own act of disobedience and want of faith, she both committed sin herself and entailed it on her descendants. Mary, on the other hand, a daughter of that fallen mother did, by her personal faith and obedience, so far as in her lay, repair the evil. Yet, opposed as they are in other respects, there *is* one point of resemblance between them, but it is an accidental one merely, their *παρθενία*. No one can imagine, and none of the Fathers think of asserting, that the existence of this Grace in Eve, without original sin at first, involves its existence in a like state of spotlessness in Mary afterwards, any more than they assert that Eve's maternity after the fall necessitates the like in Mary after the birth of Christ, which they, *uno ore*, repudiate. In a word, it is a contrast, and not a comparison, which is here raised between the mother of Cain and the mother of Christ, and Perrone's whole argument, in consequence, tells not in his favour, but against him.

Yet this misnamed 'comparison' forms one of the chief arguments of Perrone for the affirmative of the question. As to his citations from the Fathers on the same side, it is useless to extract them at length. The strongest do but speak of the Blessed Virgin Mary as 'Virgo immaculata,' 'Domina intemerata,' and the like; what they do prove being a spotlessness *κατὰ τὴν παρθενίαν*, before and at the time of Christ's birth, which none but a Cerinthian or an Ebionite would think of denying; but as to any real authority for the Roman doctrine in either of its phases, we must say, with the pardon of Perrone, that they contain not the very slightest possible. As a specimen of the rest, we will transcribe those from SS. Ambrose, Augustin, and Ephrem of Syria.

I. S. Ambrose, towards the end of his commentary on the 118th Psalm (Eng. version 119), says,—'Suscipe me in carne quæ in Adam lapsa est, suscipe me non ex Sara sed ex Maria, ut incorrupta sit virgo, sed virgo per gratiam ab omni integra labe peccati.' Now a passage like this, to which no definite meaning at all can be given, is totally unfit for controversial use. But even, if it were, a few isolated words alone will not suffice to establish, certainly and without appeal, that S. Ambrose held an opinion so novel and, to say the least, so very different to that of the rest of the Church of his time and long after—(and there is, moreover, a doubtful reading in the passage, which throws a degree of uncertainty over the whole). It is to his system as a whole on sin and grace that we must look for his full and perfect opinion on the grand *principle* at issue. Now a more full acquaintance with the writings of the Bishop of Milan would have taught Perrone that he could not possibly, without plain self-contradiction, have intended anything more

by these words, at most, than an assertion such as S. Augustin (as we shall presently see) would not have denied, though he hesitated to confess it as plainly and directly, viz. that it was not absolutely impossible that the Blessed Virgin Mary might have been preserved from actual sin after her birth by special grace;—not that she was born, much less that she was conceived without original sin. Thus, throughout his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, he lays it down, repeatedly and emphatically, that the sin of Adam attaches to all his naturally-born children, without the possibility of exception. On chap. viii. ver. 14, 'I am carnal, sold under sin,' he says,—'This is to be sold under sin'—to derive our origin from Adam, who first sinned, and by his 'own fault became subject to sin.' Again, on chap. viii. ver. 12: 'Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh to live after the flesh'—'Rectum et manifestum est, non nos ad inventionem Adæ qui carnaliter egit, obsecundare debere, qui prior peccans, mortem nobis hæreditatis titulo dereliquit.' On 1 Cor. xv. 22: 'As in Adam all die,' &c.—'Hoc dicit quia (sicut) Adam peccans mortem invenit, et omnes ex ejus origine tenuit, ut dissolvantur.' Lastly, in his book 'De Pœnitentia,' 'Christ also took our flesh, but the vices of it He took not; for He was not, as all we, born of the union of 'man and woman; but He was born of the Holy Ghost, and 'an immaculate virgin. For we all are born under sin, as we read in the Confession,—"I was shapen in iniquity,"' &c.

So when S. Hilary calls Christ's flesh '*caro peccati*,' 'carnem peccati recepit ut assumptione nostræ carnis delicta donaret, dum ejus fit particeps assumptione non crimine,' (lib. de Trin. § 13,) no one supposes him to hold that Christ was not conceived *sine macula* of the Holy Ghost, and did not sanctify the nature which He took, but lay under sin: but we interpret a saying, however strong, on one side, by what we find on the other, always remembering, that scarcely any heresy ever yet arose but, being traced back to its first cause, it is found to have consisted in the exclusive urging of a relative truth, without due allowance being made for the counteracting force of its correlative,—the perfect system consisting of the fusion of the two into one.

II. The passage of S. Augustin to which we have referred above, is as follows:—To Pelagius, who had mentioned those saints from Abel to the Blessed Virgin Mary, who '*non modo non peccasse sed etiam juste vixisse referuntur*,' S. Augustin replies:—

'Excepta itaque sancta virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quæstionem; unde enim scimus quid ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit, ad vincendum ex omni parte

peccatum, quæ concipere ac parere meruit quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum?—Tom. x. p. 145.

But this passage is only concerned with the Virgin's freedom from *actual* sin, and not at all with her freedom from original: and it is very far from being a plain affirmative even of the former. And besides, S. Augustin's opinion on the subject has already been shown to be contrary to the doctrine of Perrone. The above work against Pelagius, indeed, seems to have been written three years later than the former; but unless it can be shown positively to contradict it, which is evidently impossible, all that can be proved from it is, that, as regards the Blessed Virgin Mary herself, S. Augustin 'nulum haberi voluit questionem.'

III. S. Ephrem's words are as follows:—'*Immaculata et intacta, incorrupta et prorsus pudica atque omni sorde ac labe peccati alienissima virgo, Dei sponsa et Domina nostra inviolata, integra planeque pura et casta Virgo, Dei genetrix, sanctior Seraphim et incomparabiliter reliquis omnibus supernis exercitibus gloriosior.*' When Perrone says of these words, in reference to his previous citations, '*proprius ad rem nostram spectant,*' we may leave the obvious conclusion to our readers; but when he proceeds to affirm, as he does, '*Hæc cum maculata Beatæ Virginis origine nullo componi modo possunt,*' we must be permitted to ask for what he has not given us—some proof, however slight, of that assertion, or how words, evidently expressing only a *personal* purity and dignity, can be taken truthfully to express a spotlessness of *nature*.

In fact, even the terms '*Sanctior Seraphim et incomparabiliter reliquis omnibus supernis exercitibus gloriosior,*' strong as they undoubtedly are, contain nothing more than may be found in the pages of the highest authorities of our own Church, and apply to the Blessed Virgin Mary only as one, however personally exalted or favoured, of the redeemed. Bishop Andrewes, for instance, in his first sermon on the Nativity, speaks quite as strongly of all Christians as such. '*Here then cometh the matter of admiration; they, spirits, glorious, heavenly, immortal, yet in no wise took He them, but the seed of Abraham—Angels and not men, so in reason it should be—men and not angels, so it is; . . . They every way, in everything else above and before us, in this beneath and behind us; and we before the angels, the Cherubim, the Seraphim, and all the principalities and thrones in this dignity.*' And in his prayers he could say, at once, '*Making mention of the all-holy,*

¹ Sermons, vol. i. p. 5. 1841. Oxford Edition. Ang. Cath. Library.

'undefiled, and more than blessed Mary, mother of God, and 'ever virgin;'¹ and, also, 'In Jesus salvation, in Christ anointing, in the only-begotten Son sonship, in the Lord and 'master's treatment, in His conception and birth, the cleansing 'of our unclean conception and birth.'² To speak thus, is really to follow the voice of Holy Scripture and the Primitive Church.

To the above extracts of Perrone's we will add a few of our own from the Fathers of the Church *before* S. Augustin, whose pages,—if they contain no direct assertions on a subject, which Cave, when speaking of a period far later than theirs, justly calls 'inauditum ante in Ecclesia dogma;'—may at least enable us, indirectly and by implication, to form a judgment of what their decision would have been, could they have spoken directly on a doctrine, opposed in its first principle to that system which they held, of human redemption, themselves, and which they have delivered to us their successors. If it were indeed as Perrone represents it to be when he says, 'It will be enough 'if the *res ipsa* be handed down from antiquity, and the seeds 'or germs, so to speak, of this opinion, be found in their works, 'which opinion became always more and more explained;' our argument would have been a more difficult one: but because the contrary is so plainly the fact; because we not only do not find the germs or seeds of any such doctrine as his, in Scripture, in the early Church, in the writings of the most holy and learned of the Church of Rome herself, from the days of S. Bernard downwards,—but a system, at least in the two first, the very opposite to it, and which no ingenuity, subtlety, or learning, has ever been able to reconcile with it; therefore it is that we do not hesitate to say, that its being ruled by a single Pope as an article of faith necessary to salvation, would be a glaring insult to the voice of Scripture, and to that Church of the early Saints to which Perrone pretends to make appeal.

And, firstly, there is a certain, and not slight moral weight against Perrone, in the manner in which the early writers meet the opponents of their faith on the primary question of the Nature and Personality of our Lord; and their words do, as it appears to us, by anticipation, utterly quash and overthrow the doctrine for which Perrone is contending. They are all careful and scrupulous in laying it down, in which they surely follow the holy Apostles themselves, that He was God the Son, taking the nature of His own creature, man, of the Blessed Virgin Mary, by miraculous operation of the Holy Ghost, that so He might escape that 'contagio peccati,' which attaches to all the

¹ Prayers, 5th day, Intercession.

² Prayers, 4th day, Profession.

natural descendants of Adam, without exception, and which He expiated by His death on the cross; His sufferings thereon making, as S. Athanasius teaches us in his work, 'De Incarnatione Verbi,' an atonement not only as precious and complete as would have been made by the death of all men together, but infinitely more so, because they were those not of man only but of God Himself.

Had the early Gnostics known that it was an especial doctrine of Christianity, that His mother *also*, the naturally born daughter of mere human parents, was, from the first moment of her existence, exempt from all sin, what an advantage would it not have afforded them in their denial of His real and very manhood, and human flesh, and how prone they would have been to avail themselves of it! and how could S. Irenæus have so dwelt as he does on every point of His identity with us as the Son of Man, sin excepted in Him alone and in no one else, against the brood of Simon and Valentinus; or how could he have combated the idea, as he did, that the Son of a mother perfectly sinless, and therefore, as they might well have concluded, not really human, was not an incorporeal 'visus' as held by Saturninus, or a mere manifestation 'sub forma hominis,' as Marcion believed? 'Qui dicunt eum putative manifestum, neque in carne natum, atque vere hominem factum, adhuc sub veteri sunt damnatione, advocacionem præbentes peccato, non devicta secundum eos morte, quæ regnavit ab Adam usque ad Moysen etiam in eos qui non peccaverunt in similitudinem transgressionis Adæ.'

—p. 248. Grabe. We might cite numberless passages from the works of this father and martyr, for the moral weight they contain, and the indication they give of the direction of his belief, 1, on the Universality, with One only exception, of sin both original and actual in all men; and 2, that Christ took human nature from Mary, not already purified, but to make it pure *by* taking it.

'We maintain,' says Tertullian, 'not that the flesh of sin is destroyed by Christ, but the sin of the flesh; not the matter, but the nature; not the substance, but the fault; as the Apostle says, "He destroyed sin in the flesh;" for he elsewhere says, that "Christ came in the likeness of sinful flesh;" not that He took this likeness of the flesh, as an image of the body and not in truth, but by this term, "the likeness of sinful flesh," he means that the flesh itself of Christ was not sinful, like his who first committed sin,—it was of the kind, not of the sin of Adam, for hence we prove that there was that flesh in Christ whose nature in man is sinful, and so in Him sin is done away, that having been in Christ without *sin which in man is not found without it*. "If then," you say, "Christ put on our flesh, it was sinful in Him,"—forbear to narrow the inexplicable meaning, for putting on our flesh, He made it His; and making it His, He made it sinless.'

¹ De Carne Christi, § xvi.

Tertullian, in this piece, is arguing against the Valentinians for 'the reasonable soul and human flesh of Christ,' and he is, from the nature of the case, opposing throughout any such doctrine as that of the Immaculate Conception of any but of Christ Himself alone. His words, 'making it His, He made it sinless,' contain precisely the same doctrine as that of S. Augustine in the work already cited against Julian, and of S. Athanasius, viz. : that Christ took our flesh, and by taking it—by His contact as the Creator with His own work—He sanctified it: communicating to it, as part of Himself, that holiness without measure, which neither the malice of Satan nor the disobedience of Adam, both creatures, could ever overcome, but which was infinitely and ineffably more powerful to renew than their sin had been to destroy. He sanctified human nature Himself directly, as its God, not through Mary previously. He received it of her unsanctified; and by making it His own, it must henceforth, as His, be perfectly holy—without spot or blemish. S. Athanasius, in his piece '*De Incarnatione*,' a piece which is, of its kind, perhaps the most valuable that we have after the writings of the Apostles, speaks as follows:—

'Nor when the Virgin brought Him forth, did she suffer; nor being in a body, was He defiled by it,—but He rather sanctified His body; for if even the sun which He made, and on which we look in its course in the heavens, is not defiled by its contact with the bodies that are on the earth, nor is put out by darkness, but rather itself enlightens and purifies all things; much more was the all-holy Word of God, the Creator and Lord of the sun, when revealing Himself in a body, free from defilement,—rather, being incorruptible, He both quickened and purified the body, which in itself was dead.'¹

The sinlessness then of human nature, according to S. Athanasius, came not from Mary, but from its hypostatical union with His Godhead.

S. Epiphanius has two most remarkable, and, we might almost say, prophetic pieces against the opposite heresies of the Antidicomarianitæ and the Collyridians; the former of whom sought to lower the Blessed Virgin Mary, as an object of especial Divine favour and privilege, to the level of other women; and the latter, by sacrifice and prayers directed especially and exclusively to her, to raise her above all other members of the human race, and, in fact, place her on a level with the Divinity Itself. If he herein condemn the low and unbecoming language on the Blessed Virgin Mary used at times by some among ourselves, whose accidental position forms their sole conceivable claim to the title of English Churchmen, he as little supports the doctrine held by authority in the Church of

¹ § xvii. p. 50, vol. i. pt. i. Padua 1777.

Rome. Having said that Scripture does not declare, nor he himself know 'whether she ever died, or did not die, and were buried or were not buried,' he produces, on the one side, the prophecy of Simeon, Luke ii. 35, and, on the other, Rev. xii. 13, 14,¹ which, he says, may very well have been fulfilled of her; and he concludes:—

Ἦτοι γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ἡ ἀγία παρθένος καὶ τέθαπται, ἐν τιμῇ αὐτῆς ἡ κοίμησις, καὶ ἐν ἀγνείᾳ ἡ τελευτή, καὶ ἐν παρθενίᾳ ὁ στέφανος. Ἦτοι ἀντρεθή, καθὼς γέγραπται, Καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῆς διελεύσεται ῥομφαία, ἐν μάρτυσιν αὐτῆς τὸ κλέος, καὶ ἐν μακαρίσμοις τὸ αὐτῆς ἅγιον σῶμα δι' ἧς φῶς ἀνέτειλε τῷ κόσμῳ, ἥτοι δὲ ἔμεινε, καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀδυνατεῖ τῷ Θεῷ πάντα ποιεῖν ὅσαπερ βούλεται, τὸ τέλος γὰρ αὐτῆς οὐδεὶς ἔγνω—πέρα τοῦ δέοντος οὐ χρὴ τιμᾶν τοὺς ἁγίους, ἀλλὰ τιμᾶν τὸν δεσπότην αὐτῶν, πανσάσθω τοῖνυν ἡ πλάνη τῶν πεπλανημένων, οὕτε γὰρ Θεὸς ἡ Μαρία, οὕτε ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἔχουσα τὸ σῶμα.—§ xxiii. p. 1055.

He adds, in his next treatise,—that against the Collyridians :

'The body of the Holy Virgin was indeed holy, but she was not God, nor given to us, *εἰς προσκύνησιν*, but she herself worshipped Him who was born of her flesh. This the Gospel assures us of, relating how our Lord himself said to her, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" Lest any should think her to have been of a higher nature, he called her "woman," as foreshowing that there should be heresies and schisms, and that no one, through too much awe of her, might fall into the folly—*ληρολόγημα*—of this heresy . . . She was indeed a chosen vessel, but was still a woman, and in nothing different in nature to others, though honoured as the saints . . . as Elias, as S. John whom Christ loved, as Thecla; than whom, however, Mary is far more to be honoured, for the economy of which she was thought worthy; but neither Elias, nor John, nor any of the saints, may be worshipped . . . and if we are forbidden to worship even angels, how much more so to worship Mary, who was indeed given to Joachim and Anna, δι' εὐχῆς καὶ ἐπιμελείας, but who was born in no manner *παρὰ τὴν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν*.'—§ iv. p. 1061.

We are continually taught by the early Church, and in the most high and glowing language, of the Graces which have accrued to men from Christ's Humanity; as when S. Clement of Alexandria says that Christ, through His heavenly doctrine, *θεοποιεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον*. And S. Athanasius, to Maximus, and elsewhere: *Οὐκ ἀνθρώπου τέ τινος μετέχοντες σώματος, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου σῶμα λαμβάνοντες, θεοποιούμεθα.*² And S. Epiphanius, on the Transfiguration :

Ἡ σὰρξ, ἡ ἀπὸ Μαρίας οὔσα, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους τυγχάνουσα . . . μετεμορφούτο εἰς δόξαν, δόξαν ἐπικτωμένη τῆς θεότητος, τὴν τιμὴν τε καὶ τελειότητα, καὶ δόξαν τὴν ἐπουράνιον ἣν μὴ εἶχεν ἡ σὰρξ ἀπαρχῆς, ἐνταῦθα δὲ λαβούσα ἐν τῇ συνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον.³—*Her.* 69, p. 805. D. § 78.

¹ Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰ δοκοῦσι τινες ἐσφάλθαι, ζητησῶσι τὰ ἰχνη τῶν γράφων καὶ εὕρωσιν ἂν οὐτε θάνατον Μαρίας, οὕτε εἰ τέθηκεν οὐτε εἰ μὴ τέθηκεν, οὕτε εἰ τέθαπται οὐτε εἰ μὴ τέθαπται.—Vol. i. p. 1043.

² To Maximinus, vol. i. part ii. p. 734, § 2; and see his first letter to Serapion, § 24:—'Through the Holy Ghost we are partakers of the Divine Nature and they in whom He is, *θεοποιοῦνται*.'

³ Contra Arianos, I. § 69, p. 805. D.

And S. Basil :—

Ἡ πρὸς Θεὸν ὁμοίωσις καὶ τὸ ἀκρότατον τῶν ὀρεκτῶν Θεὸν γενίσθαι.—*De Spiritu Sancto*, vol. iii. pt. i. chap. ix. § 23. p. 27.

And S. Cyprian, 'De Idolorum vanitate' :—

'Hic est virtus Dei, hic ratio, hic sapientia ejus et gloria. Hic in Virginem delabitur, carnem Spiritus Sancti induitur, Deus cum homine miscetur. Hic Deus noster, hic Christus est, qui mediator duorum, hominem induit quem perducit ad Patrem. Quod homo est esse Christus voluit, ut et homo possit esse quod Christus est.'—*Routh. Opusc.* i. p. 275.

In whatever sense this class of assertions, meeting us as it does in every page of the writings of the early fathers, is to be taken, that is, how far, according to the strict meaning of the letter, or with a necessary saving understood of the integrity of the Divine Nature in itself,—we cannot but think that the peculiar grace which is here mentioned, is in danger of being taken by the Church of Rome from the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, to be attributed to His Mother the Blessed Virgin Mary instead, in support of which opinion we will merely cite one passage from Bishop Jeremy Taylor's 'Dissuasive' :—

'It is no wonder that Pope Leo IV. calls her a Goddess, and Turcelin the Jesuit, "Divinæ Majestatis Potestatisque sociam. Huic olim cœlestium mortaliumque principatum detulit, ad hujus arbitrium (quod hominum tutela postulat,) terras, Maria, cœlum, naturamque moderatur. Hac annuente, et per hanc, divinos thesauros et cœlestia dona largitur." Nay, in the mass books penned in 1538, and used in the Polonian churches, they call the Blessed Virgin Mary "viam ad vitam totius mundi gubernatricem, peccatorum cum Deo reconciliatricem, fontem remissionis peccatorum, lumen luminum," and at last salute her with an "Ave Universæ Trinitatis Mater."'

These expressions, Bishop Taylor assures us, are not picked out as the most singular; and he proceeds to refer to the Council of Constance, 'which did invoke the Blessed Virgin Mary in the same manner as Councils did use to invoke the Holy Ghost; they call her "the Mother of Grace, the remedy to the miserable, the fountain of mercy, and the light of the Church," attributes proper to God and incommunicable;' and he mentions the Psalter of our Lady 'of great and ancient account in the Church of Rome,' said to have been compiled by S. Bonaventure, and 'consisting of the Psalms of David, in which the name of Lord is left out, and that of Lady put in, so that whatever David said of God and Christ, the same prayers and the same praises they say of the Blessed Virgin Mary.' This Psalter is found in the sixth volume of Bonaventure's works.

Perrone, then, has so far brought no real support whatever for

¹ Oxford, 1836, p. 102.

his doctrine. There is no trace of it in the pages of Scripture; the fathers of the Church of Africa did not hold it, as is shown by Tertullian, Ferrand, and S. Augustine; it was not received by the Church of Alexandria, since her greatest champion, S. Athanasius, holds another system, and one which is in fact antagonistic to it. S. Ephrem shows that it was equally unknown to the East; and S. Ambrose's writings prove that it must look for its support elsewhere than to the West.

From the early fathers Perrone passes on to the Liturgies, which, if we do not mistake, will be found as little on his side as the other authorities to which he has appealed. 'No one,' he says, 'is ignorant that the authority of Liturgies is most extensive, inasmuch as they contain the testimony, not of one doctor or another, but of entire Churches, and they are therefore of more weight in proportion as the Church itself is of greater note, and the Liturgy more eminent for its antiquity.' We willingly admit a statement of so much force in itself, and so decisive on one side of the question or other. It might, indeed, have been expected, after so confident an assertion, that its author would have given us copious extracts from all or most of the primitive Liturgies of value to prove that, whatever may be the opinions of private doctors, the Churches themselves did hold the doctrine for which he is contending. But four brief extracts from the Liturgies of S. James, the Syrian Maronites, the Alexandrian version of S. Basil, and S. Mark, form the whole of his authorities of this class, and even these, like his Patristic citations, are to be understood, beyond a doubt, of the personal spotlessness of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of nothing else.¹

Perrone, however, has done better for his cause in withholding, than he could have done in producing the testimony of these monuments of antiquity. We shall now endeavour in some measure to supply his deficiency, and show to which side of the question their evidence does in truth preponderate.

¹ These citations are as follows:—'Commemorantes sanctissimam, immaculatam, gloriosissimam Dominam nostram, matrem Dei et semper Virginem Mariam.'—'Commemorationem agamus sanctissimæ, immaculatæ, gloriosissimæ, benedictæ Domine nostræ, Matris Dei et semper virginis Mariæ;' item, 'præcipuæ, sanctissimæ, immaculatæ.'—'In ritu pariter,' he says in continuation, 'ordinationis Chorepiscopi, qui apud Syros Maronitas obtinet, quemque ex vetusto codice vulgavit Morinus, legitur "Omnes pro eo oremus sanctam, et laudatam, et immaculatam Dominam nostram, beatam omni tempore Mariam, genetricem Dei, commemorantes." Sic etiam in liturgia S. Basilii Alexandrina legitur "Præcipue vero sanctissimæ, gloriosissimæ, immaculatæ, benedictionibus cumulatæ, Domine nostræ Deiparæ, et semper Virginis Mariæ," necnon in liturgia S. Marci, "In his sanctissimæ, intemeratæ," &c. . . . atque ita passim multa leguntur quæ modam Beatæ Virginis a quavis labe immunitatem perspicue commendant.'

There was, according to Mr. Palmer, originally one chief type of Liturgy common to all the Churches of the East, but subsequently branching off into three separate divisions, which bore the names respectively of S. James, S. Mark, and S. Basil. The last of these, as Mr. Palmer shows, is much older than the Saint whose name it bears, having been added to and improved, rather than originally framed by him; it is moreover the groundwork of the Liturgies of S. Gregory Nazianzen and S. Chrysostom, and it was used in the Churches of Constantinople; in Asia; in Egypt; and Mr. Palmer even says that there are vivid traces of it as used at Antioch in the second century.¹

'When I reflect on the vast extent of these countries,' says this eminent ritualist, 'the independence of the Churches which existed there, the power which each Bishop had of improving his Liturgy, the circumstantial varieties which we find between the Liturgies of these Churches, and yet the substantial identity of all, it seems to me difficult if not impossible to account for this identity and uniformity in any other manner than by supposing that the Apostles themselves had originated the Oriental Liturgy, and communicated it to all the Churches at their very foundation. The uniformity between these Liturgies, as extant in the fourth or fifth centuries, is such as bespeaks a common origin. Their diversity is such as to prove the remoteness of the period at which they were originated. To what remote period can we refer as exhibiting a perfect general uniformity of Liturgy except to the Apostolic age?'—Vol. i. p. 80.

The question is, then, what evidence, if any, do these works, so ancient, so extensive, and so august, afford for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception? But first for the Liturgies themselves. That of S. James was used by the churches that afterwards formed the Patriarchate of Antioch, (*Palmer*, i. p. 44,) and, if not actually the composition of the first Bishop of Jerusalem himself, it is at least to be traced to the very earliest ages, (*Ibid.* sect. i. p. 43.) We have it in the orthodox Greek version, and in the Latin of two Syriac versions, given by Renaudot in his second volume. In the former, according to Mr. Neale's translation of the text of Asseman, the priest, after he has made mention of the departed saints, patriarchs, prophets, and others, continues—

'Especially the most holy, spotless, excellently laudable, glorious Lady, the Mother of God and ever-Virgin Mary.'

To which the Choir replies:—

'It is very meet to bless thee the Mother of God, the ever-blessed, the entirely spotless; more honourable than the Cherubim and infinitely more glorious than the Seraphim; thee who didst bear without corruption, God the Word; thee, verily the Mother of God, we magnify. In thee, O full of grace, all creation exults, and the race of men; in thee, *sanctified temple*, spiritual paradise, glory of Virgins, of whom God took flesh, our God that was before the world, became a child; For He made thy womb His throne,

¹ Vol. i. p. 72.

and rendered it more extended than the Heavens; In thee, O full of grace, all creation exults; glory to thee.'—*History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. ii. p. 603.

S. Mark's Liturgy is, in the opinion of Mr. Palmer, though not of Renaudot, that of the primitive Church of Alexandria, and it is said to have been perfected by S. Cyril. Having also commemorated the Patriarchs, Apostles, &c., it proceeds briefly as follows :—

Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας, ἀχράντου, εὐλογημένης, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν, θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.—*Ren.* vol. i. p. 135.

The Liturgy of S. Basil is extant in the Greek version of Constantinople, in Mr. Palmer's opinion the original of all; and of Alexandria, which is altered from it; in the Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic, which are all, more or less, translations of the Greek of Alexandria, and in use among the Monophysites of Egypt. Of these, in the Greek of Renaudot, we find almost the same words, on this subject, as in that of S. Mark :—

Μνησθῆναι καταξίωσον Κύριε καὶ τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος εὐαρεστάντων σοὶ ἁγίων πατέρων πατριαρχῶν . . . Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας, ὑπερενδόξου, ἀχράντου, ὑπερευλογημένης, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.—*Tom.* i. p. 70.

In like manner, and in almost the same words, in S. Gregory Nazianzen's Liturgy, (which, as we have said, is built chiefly upon S. Basil's,) we read in the Greek version—

Μνήσθητι Κύριε . . . Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας, ὑπερενδόξου, ἀχράντου, ὑπερευλογημένης, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.—*Ren.* i. p. 103.

Further on, indeed, there is mention of an immaculate body, but it is Christ's, and not the Blessed Virgin Mary's :

Ὁ ἄνω τῷ Πατρὶ συγκαθήμενος, καὶ ὧδε ἡμῖν ἀοράτως σὺναι, καὶ καταξίωσον τῇ κραταίᾳ σου χεὶρι, μεταδοῦναι ἡμῖν τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματός σου καὶ δι' ἡμῶν πάντι τῷ λαῷ.

And this is in accordance with a like expression in the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom : 'Joseph, ὁ εὐσχήμων, who took down from the cross τὸ ἄχραντόν σου σώμα.' (Erasmus's version, p. 536.) The last-mentioned Liturgy affords two instances of the use of language similar to the above :—

Τῆς παναγίας, ἀχράντου, ὑπερευλογημένης, ἐνδόξου, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων μνημονεύσαντες.—*Tom.* iv. p. 525.

¹ Mr. Neale observes that the paragraph immediately preceding these words, and which contains the angelic salutation, 'is clearly an interpolation, as interrupting the sequence of the prayer.' He is perfectly right in this assertion, though the address in question is not peculiar to this particular Liturgy, for in the longer Syriac of Renaudot, which is much older than Asseman's Greek version, it is not found. And see Palmer, vol. i. p. 95.

Again,—

Τῇ πρεσβείᾳ τῆς ἀχράντου θεοποιῆς ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, ἀκατακρίτως με ἀξιῶσον διδάσθαι τὴν ἀχραντον σοῦ δωρεὰν εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. κ.τ.λ.—P. 544.

Thus much for the chief of the orthodox Liturgies of the East. Besides these there are others of a certain weight, from their antiquity and substantial contents, but of less authority than the above, both as being translations instead of originals, and as being used by bodies more or less heretical. Two Syriac versions of the Liturgy of S. James are given by Renaudot, of the longer of which—used by the Monophysites, and translated and altered from the Greek—he says that ‘although undoubtedly, as the ‘Syrians themselves confess, a translation from the Greek, yet, ‘if not positively the most ancient of all the Syriac liturgies, it ‘is undoubtedly their *fundus et exemplar*,’ (Tom. i. p. 81;) it contains a commemoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in terms very closely resembling those above: ‘Iterum atque iterum ‘commemoramus vere beatam laudatamque ab omnibus generationibus terræ, sanctam, benedictam, semper Virginem, generatricem Dei, Mariam; simulque agamus memoriam Prophetarum, ‘Apostolorum,’ &c. The shorter, used by the Syro-Jacobites, (Neale) merely mentions her, in general terms, as ‘Genetrix Dei.’

The Coptic of S. Basil, S. Gregory Nazianzen, and S. Cyril of Alexandria, in use among the Monophysites of Egypt, bear, as would be expected, like the Greek, a general resemblance to each other on the question at issue. The first concludes the Commemoration of the Saints with the words, ‘Præcipue vero ‘et maxime sanctæ et gloriæ plenæ, semper Virginis, genetricis ‘Dei, Divæ Sanctæ Mariæ.’¹ And in the other two, it is sufficient to say that there is scarcely a shadow of variation; and therefore when Perrone asserts, as he does, (pp. 106, 107,) that the festival of the Conception was celebrated by the Greeks and Easterns, from the most remote period, he has nothing more to urge in proof of it than a few words of the Typicum of S. Sabæus (A.D. 484), and of S. Andrew of Crete (A.D. 636), which speak of the conception of Mary, but in no manner as if it were immaculate: ‘Tuam hodie, religiosa Anna, celebramus conceptionem, quod, ‘absoluta sterilitatis vinculis, eam utero conceperis quæ Eum ‘potuit capere qui nusquam capi possit.’² ‘Nihil post sacras ‘litteras,’ says Renaudot, ‘potiorem inter Christianos auctorita-

¹ Renaudot, vol. i. p. 17.

² Cave tells us that Sabæus wrote a ‘Typicum,’ or order of reciting the office of the Church throughout the whole year, for the use of his monastery; it embraced fifty-nine chapters, and soon obtained in all the monasteries of Jerusalem.—Hist. Litt. I. 457.

‘tem habuit, quam publica Ecclesiarum monumenta, quæ vocem illarum representant, et eorum nomine loquuntur quodammodo. Habebant preces illæ auctores suos, qui tamen ignorabantur, neque ex eorum nomine, sed in usu Ecclesiæ quæ preces illas sacrificio quotidiano consecraverat pondus earum testimonii accedebat.’ (Vol. i. p. 156.) ‘A certain form of Liturgy,’ says Mr. Palmer, ‘prevailed in the fourth century, from Arabia to Cappadocia, and from the Mediterranean Sea to the other side of the Euphrates; and . . . this can be traced nearly up to the Apostolic age. . . . The same form of Liturgy prevailed . . . through the greater part of Asia Minor. The same form is used in Thrace, and it seems to have existed there and in Macedonia and in Greece, from time immemorial.’¹ Something of the language of this great and wide-spread witness of primitive truth we have now seen. Its words, indeed, in different Churches, are varied—its Marian doctrine is one. She is addressed by every term honourable to herself personally; she is placed at the head of all the Saints; her glories, as the Mother of God incarnate, are abundantly celebrated. Perrone himself, with Petavius, confesses that from the titles conferred on her,—‘intemerata, immaculata,’ &c.—no invincible argument for his doctrine can be deduced; and Renaudot, without suspicion, admits that ‘no one can accuse the Easterns of being deficient in the honours which are due to the Deipara, and that many may, not without reason, assert that in her worship they, in some degree, pass into excess and proceed to superstition.’ But amidst all their veneration for her, excessive as it was, of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception we find not a trace. More than this, the really Catholic verities of the *θεοτοκία* and *ἀειπαρθένεια* meet us at every turn—is it probable, or even possible, that had these Churches held the former, as either Perrone or the Mediævalists hold it, they should have united, one and all, in suppressing what would be her great and crowning grace—and that alone—copious, and in fact almost over-abundant as they are in the expression of their feelings towards her in every other respect? It is plain that such was not the belief of the framers of the Eastern Liturgies, or of the Churches and sects which used them; and that from their so constantly classing the Blessed Virgin Mary with the Patriarchs, Prophets, and others, and with only the difference of an *ἐξαιρέτως*, or a ‘maxime,’ for her personal rank, they knew of no such essential superiority on her part as the novel doctrines of the Immaculate Conception would bestow on her.

And for the Liturgies of the West, to which Perrone has not

¹ Antiquities, vol. i. p. 80.

alluded, the language of the ancient form of S. Gregory the Great is precisely the same on this subject as that of those of the East, from which we have now cited 'Communicantes et memoriam tenentes in primis gloriosæ semper Virginis Mariæ, Genetricis Dei, et Domini nostri Jesu Christi.' The doctrine of 'Sanctificatio in utero' was held by Sixtus IV., and the festival to correspond owes its institution in the Church of Rome to him. His introduction into the Breviary of the Office of Leonard Nogueroles, and its subsequent ejection by Pius V. we have already mentioned:² with the substitution by the latter Pope of the Office of the Festival of the Nativity for that of the Conception, with the change merely of the term 'Nativitas' into 'Conceptio' (but without the addition of 'immaculata' to the latter), in which he is said to have followed the example of S. Anselm. This order has since continued, and the expressions of the Breviary and Missal now stand as follows: 'Conceptio est hodie Sanctæ Mariæ,' 'Conceptionem Sanctæ Mariæ celebremus,' 'Conceptio tua Dei genetrix, virgo, gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo,' &c. Gregory XV. however gave permission to some of the Gallican Churches, as late as the years 1834 and 1843, to add the term 'Immaculata' to the ancient preface, 'Et te in Conceptione tua;' thereby setting his seal to that departure from the Mediæval type of doctrine which had lately begun to take place, by tacitly substituting an Immaculate Conception, strictly and properly so called, for the former one, which taught that the Blessed Virgin Mary was made immaculate by Grace, *after* Conception.

The next point that we have to consider is the body of evidence contained in the pages of those eminent Mediævalists, to whom we have already made allusion, as supporting the doctrine of S. Bernard, and therefore, in fact, rejecting that of Perrone; and to these we will adduce, as at once the natural sequence and conclusion of the whole question, the bulls and other documents which, as we have said, the different Popes were from time to time compelled to issue, with the view of either advancing or retarding the progress of the doctrine as the circumstances of the case and the temporary quiet of the Church demanded.

Next to S. Bernard, whose words have already been given at length, is, as we have said, Peter Lombard, the far-famed Master of the sentences, and Bishop of Paris in the middle of the twelfth century. In his third book of the sentences, Distinction 3, 'On the Flesh which the Word of God took,' 'Of what nature was it before He took it, and when it was taken?' in

¹ Op. S. Greg. Paris, 1705, vol. iii. pt. i. p. 3.

² P. 373; and note 1, p. 374.

answer to the question, 'Whether it was bound to sin,' (obligata peccato,) 'and if it were assumed as such by Him,' he replies—

'It may, indeed, be said and believed, according to the attestations of the Saints, that it was previously obnoxious to sin, as the other flesh of the Virgin; but by the operation of the Holy Spirit, it was so cleansed that it was united to the Word, free from all sin,—the punishment only remaining—and that not by necessity, but by the free will of Him who assumed it. The Holy Ghost coming into Mary cleansed her from all sin, and even freed her from all incentive to sin, either by entirely destroying it, as some think, or by so weakening it and marring its power, that no occasion of sin existed in her thereafter.'

He cites and follows S. Augustin (whose words scarcely bear him out,¹) in saying that—

'To the Blessed Virgin Mary a greater share of grace was given to conquer sin "ex omni parte,"—for the Word assumed a flesh, he continues, "peccatrici similem in pœna non in culpa," and therefore was not a sinner. But all other flesh of man is the flesh of sin. His alone is not so, because His mother conceived Him not in concupiscence but in grace. He came then, and in an immaculate body, because He was conceived without concupiscence.'

It is plain that even if, like S. Bernard, he incline to exceed the manner in which the early fathers speak of the Sanctity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, yet from following S. Augustin, as he does, his words, according to the canons of criticism, ought to be interpreted as applying to her personal spotlessness, and to that only; at any rate he is as far as possible from holding the doctrine of Perrone.

'The four books of the Sentences,' says Mosheim, 'were not only received with universal applause, but acquired also such a high degree of authority as induced the most learned doctors in all places to employ their labours in illustrating and expounding them.' In fact this great work, through the commentaries which it called into existence, may be said to have directed the mind of the Church of Rome from the end of the twelfth century to the Council of Trent. One of the first, both in time and note, among the followers of Lombard, was our own countryman, S. Alexander of Hales, in Gloucestershire, known as the Irrefragable Doctor, and the master of S. Bonaventure. In his 'Summa Theologiæ,' which Dupin proves to be the same as his work on the Sentences, at Number 2, article 2, he asks, 'Whether the Blessed Virgin Mary was sanctified, 1, ante conceptionem; or, 2, in conceptione; or, 3, post conceptionem?'

¹ 'Excepta sancta Virgine Maria, de qua, propter honorem Dei, nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, volo questionem. Inde enim scimus quod ei plus sit gratiæ collatum ad vincendum ex omni parte peccatum, quod concipere ac parere eruit quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum. Hac ergo excepta virgine, si aēs sancti et sanctæ congregari possint, et quereretur ab eis an peccatum erent, quid responderetur, nisi quod Joannes ait, cap. i. "Si dixerimus quia peccatum non haberemus, nos ipsos seduxerimus."—De Nat. et Grat. cap. 26.'

To the first question he replies decidedly in the negative; first, from the words of S. Paul to the Ephesians, chap. ii. ver. 3: 'We *all* had our conversation, in times past, in the lusts of our flesh,' &c.; and secondly from the authority of S. Bernard: and he argues, 'that as sanctification is twofold, of the Nature and of the Person, even if her parents had been sanctified personally they could not have been so, as to their nature; and that as she proceeded from the latter, which was not sanctified, she could not have been sanctified; and that although marriage in itself is lawful, and even meritorious, yet its issue cannot be holy, for S. Bernard's reason, "*Quomodo peccatum non fuit, ubi libido non deficit?*"—and therefore she could not have been immaculate in her conception.' To the last question he makes the same reply as S. Bernard, and from the same cases of Jeremiah and S. John the Baptist. 'But what was granted to them was not denied to her, and if they were sanctified *in utero*, much more so was the Blessed Virgin Mary.'

To Alexander of Hales succeeds his pupil, S. Bonaventure, 'the great light and ornament of the holy S. Francis,' as Butler terms him. He also, in his work on the Books of the Sentences, asks the same question and establishes the same conclusion as S. Alexander had done—though by a different course of reasoning—following the conclusion of S. Bernard, as opposed to that of Perrone. He holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary is not to be thought to have been sanctified before her animation, because Sanctification comes by grace, and applies to the soul and not to the body. The day of her Conception, he says, is certain, the time of her Sanctification uncertain; and therefore though the former, as that of a maculate body, should not be observed, yet the Sanctification may be celebrated; and he compares the Blessed Virgin Mary, after her sanctification, to the son of a king, 'who, having been born lame and afterwards cured, should rather be congratulated on his nativity than condoled on his affliction.' He admits that, from the propriety of the case, as the Mother of Jesus Christ and the greatest of the Saints, it may be said that she ought to have been conceived without sin; but he concludes that as S. Paul says, 'As in Adam all die,' and no one has need of redemption who is not under sin, and S. Augustin, when he says, as we have seen, that when speaking of the Blessed Virgin Mary he wishes to entertain no question about sin—(an assertion on which the maintainers of the Immaculate Conception greatly rely)—refers to actual and not to original sin,—it cannot truly be said that she was *conceived* immaculate. Though as the Church, which cannot err, celebrates her Nativity, he concludes that she was *born* holy, and therefore, that, having been under sin at her actual Conception, she was

sanctified 'in utero' before her birth—though the exact period of her Sanctification is altogether unknown.

Albertus Magnus, the master of S. Thomas Aquinas, argues that if the Blessed Virgin Mary had not been obnoxious to sin, and had therefore been herself the medicine of salvation, there would have been no need of any other saviour, and Christ's Incarnation would therefore have been superfluous. And again, that in the Church there are but two classes, the Head and the members—the former redeeming, the latter redeemed; and that the Blessed Virgin Mary not being the former, but one of the latter, she must have *received* Redemption, and therefore have lain under sin: and he gives two chief reasons why she could not have been sanctified in her parents: 1st, that the Grace of Sanctification does not come from them; and, 2dly, that as S. Bernard says, sin could not have been absent from their union.

He next tells us that the doctrine 'of a Sanctificatio ante animationem' is condemned by all the Paris Doctors (although Perrone is contending for something still higher—an absolute 'Sanctitas'), and that S. Augustin affirms, 'Omnis homo fuit Adam in naturâ præter Christum;' and he concludes, like the others, that she was sanctified after her 'animatio,' though it is not known *how long* after. But in this conclusion he has against him the words of S. Augustin, which he cites, but does not attempt to explain—'That which is not born cannot be reborn. The Grace of Sanctification confers new birth, and therefore cannot be given except to those already born.'¹

S. Thomas Aquinas himself, however, is stronger against the modern Romish doctrine than any other of his age. In his comment on the second book of the 'Sentences,' dist. 31, quest. 1, art. 2, 'Whether it is necessary that *all* men should 'be born in original sin?' he says, 'It is necessary that all men 'who are naturally born of Adam should have original sin, for if 'not, the defect in his nature, caused by sin, and from which all 'his posterity derive their original want of righteousness, must 'have been perfectly healed; which is not the case, and, therefore, all who are naturally descended from him, must be born in 'original sin.'

In his third book, dist. 3, quest. 1, he passes on to the particular question, 'Whether the Blessed Virgin Mary received Sanctification yet being 'in utero?' and he also decides it in the affirmative, chiefly because, as he says, 'the Church does not solemnize that which is not holy;'² and he concludes, that

¹ Third book of 'Sentences,' dist. 3, art. 3, vol. xv. p. 25, &c. Lyons: 1651.

² The value of this argument, so much insisted on by the Seraphic Doctor and others of his time, is greatly affected by the facts that the festival of the Nativity has not absolute Apostolic authority, whilst that of the Conception was not heard

although such Sanctification is not expressly read in Holy Scripture, either in the Old or New Testament, yet it can certainly be gathered from what is found there; for 'if S. John and Jeremiah, who foretold Christ, were sanctified, much more so was the Blessed Virgin Mary who bore Him.'

Again, in the third part of his 'Summa Theologiæ,' quest. 27, art. 1, 'Whether the Blessed Virgin Mary were sanctified before her Nativity?' he says, 'As sanctification comes of grace, and the Nativity of nature, she was not sanctified before her birth as to the latter, though, like Jeremiah and S. John, she were cleansed from any *personal* stain.' And he expressly disallows any Sanctification before her 'animatio,' such as that for which Perrone contends,—first, because she was not then 'perfecta,' wanting a soul; and secondly, because, in this case, she would have had no need of Christ's Redemption. And he concludes, that although the Church of Rome herself does not celebrate the festival of the Immaculate Conception, she tolerates its observance in other Churches; and, therefore, that the '*celebritas*' is *not to be entirely reprobated*. 'Nor do we understand,' he says, 'by the festival, that she was "*sancta*" in her Conception, but that, since it is not known at what time she was sanctified, it is her Sanctification rather than her Conception that is observed on the day dedicated to the latter: and finally, 'although her parents were sanctified and cleansed from original sin "*quoad personas*," they were not so "*quoad naturam*," and therefore that she herself at first lay under its bonds, as having been conceived "*secundum concupiscentiam parentum*;" and he is, as Gonzalez admits, 'most especially careful that whatever grace or beneficium there was, should be confessed to have been bestowed on herself alone, not on her parents, and not on her own soul "*ante animationem et constitutionem personæ*," lest a great principle of faith be destroyed, and a person set up, who, "*in se personaliter, seu ratione suæ personæ*," had no need of Redemption; but, to this end, some "*debitum*" or "*periculum*" must be laid down, "*quo, si non teneretur, non liberaretur*,"—as Gonzalez himself confesses when he says, '*Assertores piæ sententiæ communiter*

of before the twelfth century, nor formally instituted until the time of Sixtus IV., 300 years afterwards. Gonzalez says, that if Pius V. did at all derogate from the truth of the '*pia sententia*' by removing from the Breviary the office of Nogueirole—which, by the way, was done by a formal bull—he might have done so as a private Doctor merely, and not necessarily *ex cathedra*, as head of the Church. Why then may not the same licence of opinion be conceded to those, on the other hand, who venture to doubt whether the Popes have a power which the Apostles distinctly declare that themselves had not,—viz. that of deciding a thing to be or not to be at their own assertion, and, in fact, of creating articles of faith, instead of merely declaring and handing down what they have received?

'affirmant Beatam Virginem non solum habuisse debitum contra-
'hendi maculam originale, cum fuit in lumbis parentum,
'atque in prima sui conceptione, *sed etiam in ipso primo instanti*
'*animationis*.'—P. 118.

Our readers will not require us to discuss the subtleties contained in the section of his work, which Gonzalez heads with the words, 'How is S. Thomas to be understood, when he repeats 'so often that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in original 'sin?'¹ but in which he neither overthrows the force of S. Thomas' plain words, nor attempts to show (as he must do if he would have his words carry the least weight) that the voice of all history from his own day, and the unsuspecting admissions of the Doctors of his own Church,—both of which so uniformly agree in ascribing to him the foremost place in the maintenance of the ancient doctrine,—are alike entirely mistaken.

In the fourteenth century, J. D. Scotus has been claimed by both sides of the question. We have already alluded to the disputation which he is said, by more than one of the Church historians, and our own Cave among the number, to have held before the University of Paris, and by which he induced that body not only to change the opinion which it had previously held to the contrary effect, but also to issue a decree, forcing their newly adopted one on all their members. But this whole account is undoubtedly erroneous, as Alexander Natalis shows, 'first, because no author, who was contemporary with Scotus, 'makes any mention of it whatever; secondly, there is no 'account of it among the Gallican historians, or of the pope who 'directed it to be held; thirdly, the names of Scotus' opponents 'are wholly unknown; fourthly, there is no record of it in the 'archives of Paris; and lastly, the decree was not made till the 'year 1497, 58 years after the Council of Basle, and 189 years 'after the death of Scotus, which took place in 1308.'² To which we may add the fact, that Scotus' own doctrine is by no means such as to justify the historians in classing him, as they have done, among the opponents of those writers of the thirteenth century, from whose works we have just made citation.

¹ 'Ego diligenter evolvi,' says Gonzalez, 'scripta D. Thomæ, in quibus de hac controversia agit, et censeo præcipuum scopum Sancti Doctoris fuisse, probare Beatam Virginem in propria persona—id est quando incepit existere—in primo instanti animationis, indignisse Redemptione, ac proinde contagium peccati originalis illam aliquo pacto afflasse, et, pro illo primo signo animationis, dici conceptam in peccato; quia caro ejus, genita per commixtionem maris et feminae, erat infecta, et traxit secum vitium naturæ, ac proinde reddidit Beatam Virginem vere obnoxiam et subjectam maculæ formali, consistenti in privatione gratiæ debitæ. Et sic Beata Virgo vere habuit in primo instanti fomitem habitualem peccati, seu concupiscentiam habitualem, in qua, secundum D. Thomam, consistit peccatum originale, pro materiali.'—P. 117.

² Vol. xxx. § 9. p. 585, &c.

On the question whether the Blessed Virgin Mary were conceived in original sin, he cites, among other authorities, the words of S. John the Baptist, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (John i. 29); on which he says, 'He only is innocent who comes not "*per propagationem*,"'—and St. Leo, de Nativitate Dei, 'He found none free from "*reatus*,"—He came to free all, and the Blessed Virgin Mary among them,'—and S. Bernard. He admits that it may be said that Christ came to open the door to *all*, and to free *all* from sin, and that if the Blessed Virgin Mary had not had original sin, she would not have needed that act of Grace; and that, as she was born naturally, '*in coïtu*,' she was infected with sin—that she endured the sufferings of hunger, thirst, and many other trials, which were laid on her through sin, and not voluntarily assumed by her, as she was not our '*redemptrix et mediatrix*,' but were inflicted on her by God, and not unjustly, and therefore, that she was not innocent. Against this he can only suggest, that from the perfection of her Son, in that He was our Redeemer, &c., she herself, as His mother, could have had no sin.

He says, indeed, that S. Bernard's argument of sin in the Conception is overthrown by the fact that in the first moment after Baptism grace can remain '*in anima mundata*,' with the '*infectio corporis per conceptum*,' and so it might have been with the Blessed Virgin Mary '*in primo instanti*,' if God pleased to 'create' grace in her soul. This is his nearest approach to the doctrine of modern Rome; and he at least opposes the system of Perrone. In fact, his opinion on the whole question may be well summed up in the words of Dupin, among his reasons for disbelieving, as he also does, the disputation at Paris. 'Scotus did not propound the opinion of the Immaculate Conception as the certain doctrine of his time, but with some doubt of it; for after he had put the question in his third distinction upon the thirteenth (third) book of the "*Sentences*," whether the Blessed Virgin Mary were conceived without sin, he answers in three propositions—first, that God could have caused her to be born without original sin; second, he could have caused that she should not have continued in it one moment; third, that He could have caused her to remain in it some time, and then in the last instant of that time have purified her from it. After he has proved these three propositions, he concludes that none but God could know which of these things was done; but it seems most probable to him that that which is the most perfect should be attributed to the Blessed Virgin, provided that it be not contrary to the Church nor to Holy Scripture.'¹

¹ Dupin's History of the Fourteenth Century, vol. xii.

So that if we can scarcely assent to the opinion of Suarez, that he inclined to the denial of the doctrine, yet he certainly did not assert it so strongly as to justify his being claimed, decidedly and without doubt, for the affirmative side of the question; much less can he be considered its foremost and peculiar champion. Most probably, he did lean, like S. Bernard, and his immediate predecessors, to a 'sanctificatio in utero,' but with hesitation, as the question was yet undecided either way by the Church.¹

Such, as a whole, was the Marian doctrine of that great body of Divines who followed Peter Lombard. S. Anselm, the second Archbishop of Canterbury after the Norman Conquest, is supposed by some to have introduced it into our own country; but there is much to be urged against this opinion. Mabillon rejects it, and says that 'the observance of the *festival* is to be ascribed to an Abbot of S. Alban's, of the name of Gaufridus,' for, as he thinks, 'the first time in England;'² but Bulæus, in his history of the School of Paris, tells us, that its first introduction is due to Corboil, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1140.³

The ascription of both doctrine and festival to S. Anselm, rests upon no better foundation than that afforded by a piece, of doubtful authority, entitled, 'Tractatus de Conceptione Virginali et Peccato Originali.' His argument in the former is no other than the *propriety* of the Blessed Virgin's being free from sin. I. In truth, it was *becoming* that the Virgin should shine with a purity so bright, that none but that of God could be greater; for on her did God the Father so condescend to bestow His only Son, whom He begot coequal with Himself, 'de corde Suo,' and loved as Himself, that He might naturally be one and the same Son, (*communis filius*), both of God the Father and of the Virgin. II. As to herself, he confesses that, as formed by conjugal union, it is a Catholic verity to say that she was under sin. III. Or, at most, was cleansed 'per fidem ante conceptionem,' against which, it is obvious to us to urge S. Bernard's 'non potuit sancta esse antequam *esse*.' Yet, IV. he soon after seems to contradict his former admission, but only as ascribing to her a superhuman power. 'The Creator and Governor of all things has made thee the Lady and Empress

¹ Wadding's account of the controversy is that it was held at Paris, A.D. 1304, and that a marble statue of the Virgin, during its continuance, repeatedly nodded its head in approbation of Scotus' doctrine, and continues to do so 'in hodiernum diem.' The new opinion, he continues, could not have gained ground as it did, but for such a mark of Divine approbation; all the most learned men of the school of S. Thomas opposing it for three centuries. He introduced many new, and revived many old opinions, but this was his chief glory, and it is lauded by the almost universal consent of his posterity.—Annals, tom. vi. p. 52.

² Annal. Benedict. vol. vi. p. 327.

³ Vol. ii. p. 136.

‘ of the heavens and of the earth, as well as of the seas, and of
‘ all the elements, with all the things that are therein. Thou
‘ wert made and art the Lady and Queen.’ As the former
doctrine is so evidently made by him to rest on and result from
the latter, there is no obligation on us to receive it. Appended
to this piece, in the Paris edition of his works, A.D. 1721, is an
account of the manner in which the festival came to be first
introduced, namely, by three different miracles or revelations.
As this history is supposed to be by S. Anselm, and the
maintainers of the doctrine place no slight reliance on its
testimony, we have transferred it in an abbreviated form and in
an English version to our pages:—

At the time when William, the Norman duke, had over-
thrown the power of Harold, and conquered the English in
battle, a certain Abbot Elsiné lived in the Church of the
Apostles Peter and Paul, and of Augustin, the Apostle of
England, in which church repose the bones of Augustin him-
self and the Archbishops who succeeded him. The King of
Denmark, hearing of Harold’s death, determined to invade
England; on which William sent Abbot Elsiné to him to dis-
cover his designs, and, if possible, dissuade him from carrying
his hostile intentions into execution. The Abbot, having
executed his commission, set sail on his return to England, but
was soon overtaken by a violent tempest, which threatened to
destroy both the ship and crew.

In this strait they betook themselves to their prayers, invok-
ing God, the Saints, and especially the Blessed Virgin Mary.
On this there appeared a person dressed in pontifical robes,
who addressed Elsiné by his name,—‘ If you wish to be saved,
‘ if you wish to escape death, if you wish to revisit your
‘ country, if you wish to see your “Lares” once more, promise
‘ most faithfully to observe the festival day of the Conception
‘ of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and teach all those over whom
‘ you have any authority to do the same.’

‘ Thereupon the Abbot Elsiné inquired, as any prudent person
‘ would, “How can I do this, when I am utterly ignorant of the
‘ day on which it should be observed?” The divine messenger
‘ replied, “The 6th of the Ides of December is that joyful day on
‘ which I command you to keep this festival.” “How then,”
‘ said Elsiné, “shall I keep it, and with what service?” To whom
‘ the divine personage very quickly replied, “The service which
‘ is said on the day of her Nativity shall be said on the Con-
‘ ception, only changing the word Nativity into that of Concep-
‘ tion.” The Abbot, when he heard this, gave thanks to God,
‘ and devoutly promised to obey this command immediately.
‘ On his doing so the tempest ceased, and they came with speed

‘to England; and he took care to celebrate this festival himself, and bid many join him in so doing. “To them be given, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a long life on earth, and after it rest eternal.—Amen.”’

Another miracle is as follows:—

In the time of Charlemagne, the most famous King of France, a deacon, cousin to the King of Hungary, through love of the Mother of Jesus, was accustomed diligently to sing her Hours, but wishing by the advice of his parents to marry a very beautiful lady. . . he remembered one day that he had forgotten to sing them as he was accustomed to do, sent his bride home, and putting all out of the church, he remained alone by the altar of the Virgin; and as he sang and came to the Antiphon, ‘*Pulchra es, et decora, filia Jerusalem,*’ the Virgin Mary suddenly appeared to him, with two Angels, who took hold of his hands; and she said to him, ‘If I am fair and beautiful, why do you forsake me and take another bride? Am I not the more beautiful of the two? Am not I fairer than she? Where have you ever seen one so fair as I?’ He, astonished at this, replied, ‘O Lady, thy beauty exceeds that of all the world—what wouldst thou that I should do?’ She answered, ‘If you will put away the earthly spouse whom you have taken, for the love of me, you shall have me as your bride in the kingdom of heaven; and if you will yearly preach and celebrate my festival on the 6th of the Ides of December, you shall be crowned with me in the kingdom of my Son.’ On this, the Blessed Virgin Mary disappeared; but the deacon refused to return home, and, without the consent of his parents, went to an Abbey which was situated in a distant country; and there, putting on the monastic dress, and being, after a short time, through the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary, made Bishop of Aquileia, he yearly celebrated the festival of the Conception on the day enjoined, with its proper octaves, and caused it to be celebrated throughout his diocese.

But the most extraordinary of all is the following:—

A French priest, who was in the custom of singing the Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary, returning from a house where he had committed adultery with another man’s wife, entered a boat alone to cross the river Seine—‘*pelagus Sequanæ*,’ and as he sailed, he began to sing the Hours, and when he came to the Invocation ‘*Ave Maria*,’ and was got into the middle of the water, a great crowd of devils overthrew him together with his boat, and carried his soul to hell. On the third day the Mother of Jesus came, with a vast company of Angels, to the place of his torment, and said to the devils, ‘Why do you torment the soul of my servant thus unjustly?’ They replied, ‘We ought

to have him, and rightly, as he was taken in our works.' To which she replied, 'If he is his whose works he was doing, he ought in truth to be mine, as he was saying my matins when you seized him. So that you are more to blame than he is, in having acted thus unfairly to me.' On these words the devils dispersed and fled hither and thither; and the Blessed Virgin Mary restored his soul to its body, and seizing him by the arm, whom she had saved 'ab utroque funere,' she commanded the waters to stand as a wall on the right hand and on the left, and brought him from the depth of the sea to a safe port. He in joy then fell down at her feet, and said, 'O dearest Lady and most beautiful Virgin, thrice grateful to Christ, what shall I give you for the benefits which you have done to me? You have delivered me from the mouth of the lions, and my soul from the most grievous torments of hell.' To whom the Mother of Jesus replied, 'I entreat you not for the future to fall into your former sin, lest a worse fate overtake you; and I beg you besides to celebrate yearly the festival of my Conception on the 6th of the Ides of December, and teach it every where.' When she had said this, she ascended into heaven in his sight; and he, leading an eremitical life, related what had happened to all who wished to hear it. And afterwards, as long as he lived, he celebrated the feast of the Conception solemnly and devoutly, and taught its celebration to all. 'And we, brethren,' S. Anselm concludes, 'by our Archiepiscopal authority, confirm and command that no one be so taken up with things temporal and private, as not to celebrate yearly this festival of the Blessed Virgin Mary. As her Nativity is celebrated in Church, so ought her Conception to be: for unless she had been conceived she could never have been born; and as her Nativity was necessary to our salvation, so was her Conception. By the commandment of God, she was both conceived and born; hence, if divine reason is considered, the day of her *spiritual* Conception ought to be more approved than that of her Nativity.'

In fact, it may be doubted whether S. Anselm would have supported the Roman doctrine, and not rather the contrary, because in his 'Cur Deus Homo,' a genuine work and one of very great merit and value, are to be found the following plain and forcible words:—'Since it appears that He was God and the Reconciler of Sinners, it cannot be doubted that He was wholly without sin; but this could not be, unless *absque peccato de massa peccatrice est assumptus*.'¹

The question still continuing to be agitated by the rival

¹ Lib. ii. cap. 16.

orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans, at Paris, in Spain, and elsewhere, and a formal decision being absolutely necessary for the peace of the Churches and countries concerned in the dispute, the Popes were appealed to for a final and decisive edict on the subject; and we now come to the period when Papal bulls and constitutions take that place in the question which had previously been occupied by the writings of the Schoolmen. Many Popes were more or less closely concerned in the matter; but the first who issued any formal decree, seems to have been Sixtus IV., who, in 1476-7, published a Constitution commencing with the words, 'Cum præcelsa.' The title of it is as follows: 'To those who celebrate the festival of the Immaculate Conception, and are present at the festival and its octave, the same indulgences are given as are obtained "in Corporis Christi solemnitate."' And, after terming the Blessed Virgin Mary, 'Mater gratiæ, Via misericordiæ, Consolatrix,' &c., the Pope continues:—

'We consider it right, or rather her due, that all Christian people should give praises and thanks "de ipsius immaculatæ Virginis mira conceptione," and should be present at the masses and other divine offices in Church; that by the intercession and merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary, they may thus be made more fit for Divine Grace.

'Hence, confiding in the power of the same omnipotent God and the blessed Peter and Paul, by our Apostolical authority in this Constitution "in perpetuum valitura," we order and direct that all and each Christian of either sex, who shall celebrate and say the mass and office... of the festival of the Conception of the same glorious Virgin, and through its octaves, according to the pious, devout, and laudable order of our beloved son, Leonard Nogueroles, clerk of Verona, and our Notary, and which has emanated from ourselves,—or shall be present at the Canonical hours, shall obtain, as often as they do this, the same indulgences and remissions of sin as they obtain (according to the Constitutions of Urban IV. Fel. Rec. approved at the Council of Vienna, and Martin V. and others of our predecessors) who celebrate and say the Mass and Canonical hours on the festival of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, from the first vespers and through the octaves, according to the Constitution of the Church of Rome; or who are present at the Mass and Canonical hours. Given at Rome, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1466, 3d of the calends of March, (26th Feb.,) and in the 6th year of our Pontificate.'¹

After this, and in consequence of it, as we have said, came, a few years later, the following Constitution; it is entitled, 'Grave nimis,' and, without laying down any positive rule of orthodoxy on the subject, it condemns both the assertors and deniers of the doctrine, since the question has not yet been decided by the Church. Having said that he bears with difficulty to hear the sinister reports of those entrusted with the care of the Gospel,

¹ This and the following are found among the Acts of Sixtus IV., in the second volume of the 'Corpus Juris,' under the year 1476.

and that the more in proportion as offenders and offences grow more dangerous, Sixtus adds,—

‘ Since those errors which are impressed too widely and damnably on the hearts of many by public preaching can with difficulty be removed, and since the holy Roman Church publicly and solemnly celebrates a festival of the Conception of the undefiled and ever-Virgin Mary, and has ordained a special and peculiar office for it, certain preachers of different orders, as we hear, in their sermons to the people, publicly and throughout different cities and countries, do not hesitate to assert or cease to teach daily, that those who hold or say that the same glorious and Immaculate Mother of God was conceived *without* the stain of original sin, offend mortally and are heretics, and that those who celebrate the office of the same Immaculate Conception, and hear the sermons of those who teach these doctrines, sin grievously; and not content with these preachings, they publish books composed upon this argument; from the assertions and preachings of whom no slight scandals have arisen in the minds of the faithful, and still greater are dreaded as about to rise daily. We therefore wishing to put an end to these offences, of our own will and not at the motion of any other, by our apostolical authority and by the tenor of these presents, do reprobate and condemn this assertion of the same preachers, or any others who venture to affirm that they who believe the Blessed Virgin Mary to have been preserved from original sin in her Conception; or who either celebrate the Office of her Conception or hear sermons, incur the guilt of sin,—as false and erroneous, and altogether alien to the truth, with the aforesaid books containing the above teaching.’

Sixtus then decrees that all, of what rank or degree soever, who venture to maintain in their sermons to the people or elsewhere, that the opinions now disapproved by him, are true, shall incur sentence of excommunication, from which, except in *articulo mortis*, they shall not be freed by any but the Pope himself.

‘ At the same time,’ continues this singular document, ‘ we, by our own authority and of our own free will, as aforesaid, do subject to the same penalty and censure all those who venture to say that they who hold the CONTRARY opinion, viz. that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin, incur the crime of heresy or of mortal sin, since the question has not yet been decided by the Roman See. Given at Rome, A.D. 1483, the day before the Calends of September (August 31st), in the 13th year of our Pontificate.’

Eighty years after, viz. in 1568, Pius V.’s bull ‘ Quod a nobis,’ having provided for the uniformity of the Breviaries, and turned out Nogarole’s office, gave 100 days’ indulgence to those ‘ who celebrated either the office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or that of the dead.’

But in 1570 he published his bull ‘ Super speculum,’ to this effect :—

‘ The seculars and regulars both languish over questions and differences of words, and especially when the conversation turns on the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, contend as pertinaciously for both sides as if this were one of those doctrines which must be believed with the heart and confessed with the mouth, to salvation. When Christ has not spoken, nor the Roman See, the Mother of Churches and *doctrinx disciplinæ*, decided anything

on the subject, no one can, without temerity, hold either way; and, as to broken cisterns, so do they come to such foolish and unprofitable questions, which generate strife, and which the multitude cannot understand, nor the learned derive any benefit from, but of which the majority are wholly ignorant, understanding neither what the preachers say, nor of what they affirm or deny; thus the minds of many are unsettled and stirred up by those who should rather quiet and compose them.

'We therefore, following the example of our predecessors, and especially that of the Council of Trent, give to each party permission to hold either side of the question, as he thinks it the more right or the more probable,—of our own will, therefore, and at the prompting of no one whatever, we hereby confirm and republish the Constitutions of Sixtus, which were renewed by Trent.

'And to render this the more effectual, we order and direct that no one, of what order, degree, or dignity soever, do in any popular assemblies, or in any place where there is a promiscuous concourse of men and women accustomed to meet together, dispute at all on this question, or endeavour, by arguments or the authority of the Doctors, to make good his own opinion, or destroy that of his opponents; or presume to write or dictate on the matter in the vulgar tongue, under pretence of piety or necessity; and whoever breaks this order, shall, if a Cleric, be deprived and suspended from all his ranks and dignities whatever, and be rendered incapable of future promotion, except at the hands and by the absolution of the Pope for the time being, and be subject, if needs be, to any other penalties from his own Bishop, according to the measure of his offence.'

'But it shall be allowed, as long as the Apostolic See has not decided the question, for learned men, in public seminaries, or chapters, or elsewhere, when no scandal can ensue, to discuss the question, and to attack or defend either side—so that neither of the two opinions be treated as erroneous, and all the rules laid down by our predecessor Sixtus be kept, which, as before said, we now renew. All ordinaries, vicars, and officials whatever, are commanded to see that this bull is published in every Diocese, under pain of excommunication.'

Among the bulls of Paul V., in the year 1616, we find that of 'Regis pacifici,' which 'renews the Constitutions of Sixtus IV.' (given above), 'of the Council of Trent, and of Pius V.'

'Yet,' it continues, 'in despite of these, differences and scandals still continue, and are in great danger of increasing; and we therefore order that the penalties contained in the above be renewed in all cases of offence against their rule, until the controversy is decided by the Roman See.'

Six years after this, A.D. 1622, Gregory XV., Paul V.'s successor, issued his 'Sanctissimus Dominus noster,' which, if more stringent in its penalties, is not more conclusive in its Theological decision:—

'He forbade the doctrine that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in sin, to be held in any public assembly whatever, under pain of the censures laid down by the previous Popes; but by this prohibition,' continues the Pontiff, 'it is not our intention to reprobate the opposite opinion, but to leave it where it is, forbidding those who hold the negative to meddle with such as prefer the opposite side of the question; and he proceeds 'to forbid

¹ *latter* to be handled, even in private writings or conversations,' but with

a reassertion 'that it is not his intention to close the question, but to suffer it to remain undecided, as was done by Sixtus IV., Pius V., and Paul V.' Yet he further orders, 'that the Holy Roman Church do celebrate the festival of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and do use therein only the word "Conception," under the penalties before mentioned.'¹

This last addition has given some ground for the festival's having been ascribed, in fact, to Gregory XV.

But this rule being also found insufficient to close the question, Alexander VII., at the entreaty of the court of Spain, that the Pope would give some authoritative decision which should put a final end to those differences and divisions which still continued to exist, published in the year 1661 the bull '*Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum*,' saying that—

'Whereas the belief that the soul of the Blessed Virgin Mary was in the first moment of her creation, and of its infusion into her body, by special grace and privilege of God, and through the merits of her Son preserved from all stain of original sin—in which sense the Conception is observed by the faithful—was increased by the Constitutions of Sixtus IV. and of Trent, so that it now prevails throughout almost all the Church Catholic, and because the opposite opinion arose in the Church, with much offence to God, and scandals among the people; therefore Paul V. forbade it to be held, and Gregory XV. renewed his prohibition.

'Yet the Church of Spain and the King have sent to us to say, that the denial of the Immaculate Conception still holds its ground, and that many do not hesitate to say that the Church of Rome does not forbid it,—thereby causing numerous offences.'

To support his predecessors and uphold the festival and doctrine, he renews their former constitutions, ordering,

'That all and each who venture to attack the festival by arguments of any kind, shall hereby be subjected to the penalties laid down by Sixtus IV., of deprivation, with permission to receive Absolution only from the Pontiff himself. Whilst the books in which the doctrine or festival are disputed about, written, or to be written hereafter, shall be placed in the list of prohibited works.

'Yet it is also forbidden—keeping to Sixtus IV.'s constitutions—to term the doctrine that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in sin, either heresy or mortal sin, since the question is not decided nor intended to be decided now.'²

But the most extraordinary part of the history of this portion of the Bullarium yet remains to be told. It is a maxim, as all know, of the Church of Rome that every word of S. Peter, uttered through his successor, is binding on the whole Church, and that no rule once issued by him can ever afterwards fall to the ground or be forgotten. Perrone's work is avowedly an inquiry, 'whether a dogmatic decree can be defined' by the Pope, which shall once and for ever decide that the doctrine in question is a part of the Catholic faith. And Pius IX., as we shall shortly see, has since proposed the same question to the

¹ Cherubini, tom. iii. p. 477.

² Ibid. tom. vi. p. 152,

whole Hierarchy of the Roman Church. Yet this has in fact actually been done already—and no longer ago than the year 1708, by Pope Clement XI., who, in his Bull ‘*Commissi nobis Divinitus*,’ speaks thus:—

‘The “ratio” of the sacred Apostolate divinely committed to us, demands that, after the manner of so many Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, we should increase and spread throughout all lands the worship of the most glorious Virgin Mary “*Dei genetricis*,” whose conception caused joy to the whole world, and who, exalted above the bands of angels, is a careful petitioner for every Christian, interceding earnestly in Heaven with Him whom she bore. We ourselves earnestly labour, as far as is granted to us from on high, to merit her most powerful assistance in the midst of so many and great necessities of the Christian State and Catholic Church, by which we are oppressed.

‘Incited then by our sincere devotion to the same most august Queen of heaven, our patroness and advocate, we, of our Apostolical authority and by the tenor of these presents, do direct, decree, and command, that the festival of the Conception of the Blessed and Immaculate Virgin Mary be henceforth celebrated every where throughout the world, by all and each of the faithful of either sex, as the other festivals.

‘All other and contrary Apostolical Constitutions and orders whatsoever notwithstanding.’

And in conclusion it directs that,

‘Copies of this bull be made under the hand of the public notary, and the seal of some one of Ecclesiastical dignity, to which the same obedience shall be shown as would have been given to these presents, could they have been published or publicly exhibited.

‘*Dictum Romæ ap. Sanctum Petrum sub Annulo Piscatoris, die vi. Dec. MDCCVIII. Pontificatus nostri anno nono.*’¹

It remains therefore to be shown how, with such a document as this, the question can any longer be treated as an open one by the Church of Rome, or what additional authority any bull issued by Pius IX. could have over and above this of Clement’s. Nor can we avoid the expression of our surprise that Perrone and Pius IX. should have so completely overlooked what is nothing less than a formal and decisive edict and law of their Church, as never once to allude to it in any manner whatever. It is true, that Clement orders the celebration of the *festival*, whilst Pius IX. regards rather the establishment of the *doctrine* of the Immaculate Conception. But we reply: first, that the institution of the former clearly implies and presupposes the existence of the latter, if it have any meaning at all,—at least it does so on any other grounds of morality than the very questionable one of Gregory XV., already alluded to,—and even if it were not so, we must still urge, in the second place, that Pius IX., in his particular object of defining and declaring the *doctrine* of the Immaculate Conception, has been anticipated by

¹ Bullarium Romanum, 1735, tom. x. part 1.

his predecessor, Gregory XVI., in the addition of the term 'Immaculata,' which, as we have said, that Pope ventured to make to the preface of the Mass of the Conception, and other like interpolations; so that the issue of any such decree as that contemplated by him, would be simply supererogatory, not to say a mere absurdity.

Yet such he certainly does contemplate, for from Gaeta, in the year 1849, he issued the following document, entitled, 'Encyclical Letter of the Pope on the Mystery of the Immaculate Conception : '—

'To our Venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the whole Catholic world. Pius P. P. IX.

'VENERABLE BRETHREN,—Health and Apostolical Benediction. As soon as, by the counsel of Divine Providence, and certainly for no merit of our own, we were raised to the lofty throne of the Prince of the Apostles, and undertook the government of the universal Church, it was our chiefest consolation, venerable Brethren, to learn how, in the pontificate of our predecessor, Gregory XVI. of blessed memory, there had sprung up in a wonderful manner, throughout the Catholic world, a most ardent desire that the Apostolic See should at length, by some solemn judgment, define that the most holy Mother of God, the most loving mother of us all, the Immaculate Virgin Mary, had been conceived without original sin. This most pious desire is clearly and openly testified and demonstrated by the continual petitions which have been addressed to our predecessor, and also to ourselves, by the most illustrious bishops, chapters, and religious orders—among these, the renowned order of Friars Preachers was foremost in imploring permission, publicly and openly, to pronounce and add in the sacred Liturgy, and especially in the Preface of the Mass of the Conception of the most Blessed Virgin, the word *Immaculate*. These petitions were most willingly granted, as well by our predecessor as by ourselves. To all this, venerable Brethren, have been added the letters of very many of your colleagues, incessantly addressed to our predecessor and ourselves, begging, with reiterated petitions and redoubled zeal, that we should define it as a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that the Conception of the most Blessed Virgin Mary was altogether Immaculate, and utterly free from all stain of original sin. Neither have there been wanting, in this age of ours, men of eminent abilities, virtue, piety, and learning, who, in their erudite and laborious writings, have thrown such light on this argument and most devout opinion, that not a few have wondered how the Church and Apostolic See should refrain from decreeing to the most holy Virgin this honour, which the common piety of the faithful eagerly desires should be paid to her by the authority and solemn judgment of that Church and See.

'These desires, indeed, have been most acceptable and delightful to us, who, from our earliest years, have had nothing dearer, nothing more at heart, than to revere the most Blessed Virgin Mary with an especial piety and homage, and the most intimate affections of our heart, and to do everything which might seem likely to procure her greater glory and praise, and to amplify her worship. From the very beginning of our pontificate, therefore, we have, with the utmost alacrity and earnestness, turned our anxious thoughts towards a matter of such moment; and we have never omitted to pour out humble and fervent prayers to Almighty God, that He might vouchsafe to illumine our mind with the light of His heavenly grace, that we might know what we were to do in this affair. Indeed, it is now our

chief hope and confidence, that the most Blessed Virgin, who "has raised the eminence of her merits above all the choirs of Angels, even to the throne of the Deity,"¹ and has, by the foot of her power, crushed the head of the ancient serpent, and who "set up between Christ and the Church"² all sweetness and the plenitude of graces, has ever rescued the people of Christ from the direst calamities and the snares and violence of all enemies, and saved them from utter ruin,—will now have pity on us with a mother's love; and by her most august, ready, and prevailing power with God, will, as she is ever wont, turn away the most sad and mournful reverses, the bitter distresses, labours, and necessities, and the scourges of the Divine wrath, wherewith for our sins we are afflicted; and calm and dissipate those tumultuous storms of various ills, wherewith, to our incredible grief, the Church is everywhere tossed to and fro,—and finally turn our sorrow into joy. You know full well, venerable Brethren, that the whole ground of our confidence is placed on the most holy Virgin, since God "has vested the plenitude of all good in Mary; so that henceforth, if there be in us any hope, if there be any grace, if there be any health, we know that it is from her that it redounds, . . . for such hath been the will of Him who would have us possess all through Mary."³

'We have, therefore, selected certain ecclesiastics of known piety, and eminently versed in theological studies, together with some of our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, illustrious for virtue, religion, counsel, prudence, and the knowledge of divine things; and to them we have committed the duty of examining with the minutest accuracy, and with all their prudence and erudition, this most momentous question; and they are to use all diligence in laying their opinions before us. While the matter is in this state, we have determined to follow the footsteps of our illustrious predecessors, and to emulate their examples; and in pursuance of this determination, venerable Brethren, we address these letters to you, in order that we may greatly rouse your well-known devotion and episcopal solicitude; and we charge you solemnly, each of you according to your own judgment and discretion, to command public prayers in your diocese, and to see to the fulfilment of your command, that the most merciful Father of lights may vouchsafe to shed upon us the heavenly brightness of His divine Spirit, and to give us an inspiration from above, in order that, in a matter of such moment, we may be able to take that course which shall be to the greater glory of His holy name, to the greater praise of the most Blessed Virgin, and for the greater good of the Church on earth. We have a lively wish that you should, as soon as possible, make known to us with what devotion your Clergy and faithful people are animated towards the Conception of the Immaculate Virgin, and what desire they have to behold the Apostolic See promulgate a decree in this matter. We above all desire to know, venerable Brethren, what are in this respect the wishes and feelings of your eminent wisdom.

'And as we have already permitted to the Roman clergy to recite a certain office of the Conception of the most holy Virgin, composed and printed very recently, in place of the office which is found in the ordinary Breviary, we also accord to you, venerable Brothers, the faculty of permitting all the clergy of your dioceses, if you judge it convenient, to recite freely and lawfully the same office of the Conception of the most holy Virgin which is actually used by the Roman clergy, without your demanding this permission of us, or of our sacred Congregation of Rites.

¹ S. Gregory, *Pass. de Exposit. in Libros Regum.*

² S. Bernard. *Serm. in cap. xii. Apocalyps.*

³ S. Bernard. in *Nativit. S. Mariæ de Aqueductu.*

'We make no doubt, venerable Brothers, but that your singular piety towards the most blessed Virgin will make you, with the utmost diligence and the most lively interest, comply with the desires we express to you, and that you will hasten to transmit to us, within a convenient time, the answers which we require of you. Meanwhile, receive as a pledge of all celestial favours, and above all as a witness of our good-will towards you, the Apostolic benediction, which we give from the bottom of our heart to you, venerable Brethren, as well as to all the clergy and all the faithful laity entrusted to your vigilance.

'Given at Gaeta, on the 2d day of February, in the year 1849, in the third year of our Pontificate.'

This 'Papal Address' produced the following 'Pastoral of the Bishop of Melipotamus on the Pope's Encyclical Letter on the 'Mystery of the Immaculate Conception':—

'NICHOLAS, by the grace of God, and the favour of the Apostolic See, Bishop of Melipotamus, and Vicar-apostolic of the London District, to our dearly-beloved in Christ, the Clergy, secular and regular, and the laity of the London District, health and benediction in the Lord.

'If the banishment of our Holy Father from Rome has been to us a cause of sorrow, God has in part also turned it into a source of consolation; for while, on the one hand, it has given occasion to the whole Catholic world to testify its love and reverence for the Supreme Pontiff in his afflictions, more almost than when he filled a temporal throne, it has no less shown him to us calmly exercising in his place of exile those highest prerogatives of universal rule over the Church, whereof no temporal calamities can deprive the successor of S. Peter.

'Not only, dearly beloved in Christ, has he carefully provided for the continuance of the ordinary functions of church government, but his thoughts and his heart have been filled with those greater duties which belong to his high office—the guardianship of the faith, and the promotion of piety and devotion.

'With these great objects before him, his Holiness Pope Pius IX. has addressed to all the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Catholic Church an Encyclical Letter, or circular, the purport of which we cannot better make known to you than by laying before you the principal part of the valuable document itself.' (Here followed the principal part of the Encyclical Letter.)

'To no part of the Catholic Church can this announcement and this call to prayer be more welcome than to us, dearly beloved, whose fathers so particularly held and promoted belief in this mystery of Mary's Immaculate Conception, and gave to the Church the feast in which it is commemorated. Who, then, shall feel more anxious than we to learn the decision of so great a point, the sure holding of which by the affections, as well as by the confident belief of the faithful, has been already a source of so many blessings to the Church? Who shall pray more fervently than we, that the Spirit of God will guide the counsels of the Holy Father to the right definition of so important a doctrine, which interests the dearest feelings of every breast alive to the prerogatives of Mary? It is, in truth, a solemn and most moving occurrence, when the Church of God, not aroused from without by the assaults of heresy, nor alarmed within by the creeping spread of baneful error, but moved and almost uplifted by the heaving and swelling piety of her own best children, rises up to declare a dogma of faith; which needs not to be hedged with anathemas to guard it, but lodges at once safely in the glad embrace of every Catholic heart; which bears not

with it one drop of bitter condemnation, but sheds forth on every side a new fragrance and a new sweetness over the surface and within the soul of the entire Catholic world. And if the chief pastor of the Church has, in his humility, condescended to solicit your prayers, that he may be rightly guided in so important a matter, you will not certainly refuse to give them, in all the simplicity of your faith, and the fervour of your filial love.

‘The month of May, sacred in the Church to the Blessed Mother of God, comes most opportunely to favour the discharge of this pleasing duty. Gladly have we seen the devotion of this month spread rapidly through this country, and afford much joy and consolation to every class of the faithful. But we feel every confidence that, with the new impulse now given, it will become universal, and be observed with increased fervour. We trust that in every church or chapel in our district, where it is possible, some devotion will be performed and instruction will be given, with reference to the peculiar dedication of the month to Mary, the immaculate Virgin Mother of God. And where this cannot be done daily, nor even several times in the week, let it be on Sundays at least. Anxious, therefore, to unite the particular object of prayer enjoined by the Holy Father with the annual and more general devotion of the season, the Bishops Vicars-apostolic of all England assembled, according to their wont, in London, have unanimously resolved to address their flocks in the same words, through this their and our Pastoral, published by each in his own district, that so there may be a uniform and joint supplication sent up to the Throne of Grace from the whole body of the faithful, priests and people. And all unite in ordering and strongly recommending to the piety of all Catholics the following mode of carrying out his Holiness’ desire :—

‘First.—This Pastoral shall be read in every church and chapel, on Sunday, the 29th instant.

‘Secondly.—The month of May shall be kept as sacred to the Blessed Virgin, in the best mode that this can be done, according to the circumstances of each mission.

‘Thirdly.—Where there is a daily or frequent special devotion, the Litany of Loretto shall be said or sung; where benediction is given, in that office.

‘Fourthly.—There shall also be sung or recited the hymn *Veni Creator*, with the usual versicle, response, and prayer; to which must be added the prayer *Mentes nostras*, from the Mass of Wednesday in Whitsun-week.

‘Fifthly.—Where no special observance of the month can be kept, the Litany and hymn as above shall be sung or recited every Sunday during the month.

‘Sixthly.—The faithful are earnestly exhorted to offer up at least one Communion during the month for the intention of the Holy Father.

‘Nothing doubting, dearly beloved, that you will gladly embrace the opportunity thus afforded you of practising devotion towards the Blessed Mother of God, and promoting her honour, and through it that of her thrice-blessed Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, we hereby impart and communicate to you that special Apostolic benediction which the Father of the Faithful on this occasion fervently bestows on all his spiritual children.

‘Given at London, this 23d day of April, being the feast of St. George, patron of England, in the year of our Lord, 1849.

✠ NICHOLAS, Bishop of Melipotamus.’

Here the matter at present rests. On the whole, therefore, we may surely say, that on this question at least there is not, and never has been, any one doctrine uniformly taught in the Church of Rome, but that Doctors have opposed Doctors, and Popes have opposed Popes; some leaning to the affirmative, others to

the negative, and others, again, and by far the largest number, avowedly leaving it open and undecided. So forcible are the statements of Launoy, a Jansenist of the seventeenth century, to this effect, that we venture, before quitting the subject, to give a digest of his two treatises on it, the more so as much that he tells us rests on local sources of information, to which few can have access.

His first treatise, which is divided into Prescriptions, like Tertullian's work against the Heretics, treats the doctrine generally. In the first Prescription he sets out with laying it down that 'the question is to be decided from the words of Scripture, and 'the voice of the Fathers and Councils.'

Presc. 2. 'If the question had been raised any time before the year 1300, it would have been decided that the Blessed Virgin 'Mary was conceived in sin like other human creatures.'

Presc. 3. 'From the time of J. D. Scotus, 1308, the writers 'are of suspicious character and slight authority, and Scotus' 'own arguments are "vana ac futilia," as resting neither on 'Holy Scripture nor on Ecclesiastical Tradition.'

Presc. 4. 'At first the Franciscans themselves rejected the 'Immaculate Conception. Alvarus, A.D. 1330, approved the 'opposite opinion; as did S. Alexander, S. Thomas, S. Bonaventura; and he called the Immaculate Conception "nova et 'phantastica."—(Yet Alvarus only speaks of a 'Sanctificatio post Conceptionem,' not of an Immaculate Conception properly so called. Then follows a list of names of no particular note on the primitive side of the question.)

Presc. 6. 'In the course of time the Franciscans deserted their 'opinion, or rather the doctrine of the Church. The Preachers, 'however, always kept it, and *needed neither revelations nor 'any other like kind of assistance.* "Veritas, hominum mendacio 'non eget.'"

Presc. 7. 'So with the Jesuits. They soon deserted the 'moderation of Loyola and their other early Doctors. Maldonatus disapproved the Immaculate Conception, as appears from 'his having reprehended the University of Paris, A.D. 1574, for 'introducing it and requiring an oath from their members to 'support it; which caused much disturbance, the Bishop of 'Paris siding with Maldonatus, and ended in an unsatisfactory 'appeal to the Pope. At this time the Jesuits thought differently 'to what they did afterwards.'

Presc. 9. Launoy brings against the doctrine thirteen citations from the Theological writings of seven Popes, viz. four from S. Leo, (A.D. 461,) to show that Jesus Christ alone, as having been Conceived miraculously, is Immaculate in His Conception. The following words of one of them may serve as a specimen of

the whole. 'Jesus Christ our Lord, alone among the sons of men, was innocent in His birth, because He alone was conceived without the stain of carnal concupiscence.'

Two from Gelasius, (Pope, A.D. 496,)—'Whatsoever our first parents produced of their seed, was indeed the work of God according to the institution of nature, but was not without the contagion of sin, which it inherited from their first disobedience.'

One from S. Gregory, (A.D. 590,)—'John the Baptist was conceived in sin, Christ alone was conceived without sin,—both indeed were born in Grace, and therefore the Nativity of both is celebrated, but only the Conception of Christ.'

Three from Innocent III. (A.D. 1216,)—'Mary was born in sin, but she brought forth without sin.'

One from Innocent V. (A.D. 1276,)—'It seems pious and right, though not found in Scripture, that shortly after her "Animatio," either in the very day or hour, but not in the actual moment, she should have been sanctified.'

One from John XXII. or Benedict XII. (A.D. 1342,) on the Assumption: 'She passed, firstly, from a state of original sin; secondly, from a state of "filiatio" to maternal honour; thirdly, from a state of "misery" to one of glory.'

One from Clement VI. (A.D. 1352,)—'I suppose that, according to common opinion, the Blessed Virgin Mary was in original sin for a short period, because, according to all, as soon as she could be sanctified she was sanctified.' After Clement came Sixtus IV., whom, as already said, Launoy accuses 'of having deformed and corrupted the original doctrine.'

Presc. 11 tells us that 'the addition of the Council of Trent to its decree on original sin, which we have already cited, is probably spurious, because it is not found in the Paris editions of 1546, 1551, 1555, and others.' But this seems doubtful, as it is found in the Milan edition of 1548, and is said, by the Dominican Catharinus, who was present, to have been received with the unanimous consent of the whole Council—and Launoy himself soon afterwards virtually abandons his objection.

The second and last division consists of an inquiry how the University of Paris, after their change of opinion and the oath which they forced on their members, stands affected,

1st. To the Church of Rome, from the year 1497 (that of the above change of opinion and decree) to 1575 (the year of the condemnation of the Maculate Conception, as held by Maldonatus, 'as heretical.')

2d. To the Council of Trent, from the year 1546 (the year of the Council) to 1575.

As the University in question was for a long time the head-

quarters of the Immaculate Conception, this dissertation is, in fact, an inquiry into the tenableness of the doctrine itself.—

‘Two chief points occur with regard to the first epoch—one with regard to the second.

‘The first is the definition of the Council of Basle, (A.D. 1439,) Session 36, that, on this doubtful question, after well weighing both sides, they decided for the Immaculate Conception.’

From this result the following ‘Considerations’ :—

‘Consid. 1. This Council, at the 36th Session, had not the same authority as it had up to the end of the 27th. The Pope’s bull to move it to Ferrara was pronounced by it to be null and void in the 29th Session, and those who obeyed him were excommunicated. In the 34th Session the Council deposed Eugenius. On account of this schism the Council did not represent the whole Church.

‘Consid. 2. The decision of Basle is not to be endured, as disregarding the ancient Tradition of the Roman Church, which was originally as follows. Innocent III. (A.D. 1216) says in his sermon on the Purification, “when the Holy Ghost came upon Mary she was ‘mundata a fomite carnis;’ she was visited by the Holy Ghost before, ‘in utero matris,’ when He cleansed her soul from original sin, yet Christ alone was conceived ‘sine culpa.’”’

Here follow other citations, similar to those given before, from the Popes.

‘Consid. 3.—1. The Council was not right in saying that the Immaculate Conception was a doctrine consonant with Ecclesiastical cultus, because the Church of Rome had altered the Office a century before the Council, originally observing, as in other Churches, not the feast of the Conception, but that of the Sanctification.

‘2. The Council, again, calls the Immaculate Conception a “doctrine agreeable to the Catholic faith.” This “agreeableness” was wanting in the Roman Church in the times of Innocent III. (A.D. 1216,) ‘Innocent V.’ (A.D. 1276,) ‘John XXII.’ (A.D. 1342,) ‘Clement VI.’ (A.D. 1352.) And yet the two Innocents and Clement were Paris Doctors, and most worthily promoted to the Pontificate—nor is there any thing on the doctrine in the three great Creeds of the Apostles, Nice, or S. Athanasius.

‘3. It also terms it “agreeable to reason.” Natural reason has nothing to do with such a question either way; and Christian reason was, in this case, also wanting in the Roman Church in the times of the above Popes.

‘Lastly, it is pronounced to be “according to Holy Scripture,” in which case the meaning of Scripture was wholly unknown to the Church, during the times of the same Popes, the heads of it. Nor do the citations brought from Scripture to support the doctrine, at all apply to it, but they are mere fallacies, as concluding from a particular to a general. So that the reasons adduced by this Council for the doctrine are “most weak and contemptible.”’

The second point is Sixtus IV.’s Decree ‘Grave nimis,’ issued A. D. 1483—and given by us already—‘on which,’ Launoy says, ‘it is plain,—

‘1. That the asserters and deniers of the Immaculate Conception mutually accused each other of heresy.

‘2. That tumults had been raised on both sides.

' 3. That Sixtus had not fully fathomed the opinion of either side, since he says, "the question is not yet decided by the Church."

Fourteen years afterwards—(A.D. 1497)—came the Paris decree on the subject—on which says Launoy:—

' 1. The words of it, "*majorum nostrorum vestigia sequentes*," can only refer back one century, for before that period the Paris Doctors stood by the contrary doctrine. By it the following list of their own authorities, all of the first place "*dignitatum splendore, doctrinæ et morum sanctitatis laude*," are branded as teaching a doctrine termed by their successors "*false, impious, and erroneous*," viz.—

' Clement VI.—William Okam, Nicholas de Lyra, Alexander of Hales, Franciscans.

' Durandus, Bishop of Meux, Preacher.

' Innocent V., S. Thomas, S. Bonaventure, Albertus Magnus, Dominicans; Peter Lombard, &c. &c.

' 2. It appears from Gerson that even Bishops have no power to term any proposition heretical, of which, "*ex se et ex jure*," it is altogether doubtful if it oppose the faith,—which is not scandalous—and ignorance as to the truth or falsehood of which can exist "*sine periculo*;" and as of course he did not grant to the priesthood what he denied to the Episcopate, he would not have thought the Faculty right in declaring the Maculate Conception to be "*false, impious, and erroneous*."

' 3. Nor did the Council of Basle so condemn it.

' 4. The Faculty also opposed Sixtus IV., who left the question open, thereby nullifying their brand of the negative opinion. . . . From hence arose very great scandals, and no one can venture to deny that there was both a very wide and a very plain contradiction between Sixtus IV. and the Faculty of Paris.

' Now to come to the year 1575.

' But first, by the way, in 1546, Trent, in the 5th Session, published its declaration at the end of the decree on original sin. Fourteen years after, the Faculty of Paris condemned, among other propositions, the following, "No one but Christ is without original sin, and the Blessed Virgin Mary was dead through the sin she derived from Adam; and all her sufferings through life, like those of the Saints and Martyrs, were punishments of sin—original or actual;" declaring it to be "*heretical in all its assertions, and injurious to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints*."

' The Faculty passed a like censure at the end of 1574, and the beginning of 1575—Maldonatus opposed them, and the Faculty branded him with heresy.

' On this observe, 1st, That the Faculty have gone from the Council of Basle, which did not, like them, define the Immaculate Conception to be held "*de fide*."

' 2. It has also gone from the Church of Rome and the Apostolic See, which, as Sixtus IV. said, has not yet decided the question.

' 3. It has broken the permission which Sixtus gave, that each side should continue to hold its own opinion, so that neither termed the other heretical.

' 4. It has disobeyed the injunction of Trent, directing that Sixtus IV.'s "*prescription*" should be observed.

' 5. It has, "*ipso facto*," incurred the censure of Sixtus IV. on those who should break that order—and has thereby confirmed its "*dissidium*" with the Council of Basle, Sixtus IV. and Trent.

' So that the state of the University of Paris, first to the Church of Rome, from the year 1497 to 1575, second to Trent, from the year 1546 to 1575, is one of discord and most evident schism.

'It will not be foreign to the purpose briefly to state in this place the judgment given by Cardinal Perrone on the subject, "The Doctors of the Sorbonne," he says, "stand by it; S. Thomas opposed it; both opinions might have something said for them, but if either is better than the other, I judge that of the Dominicans to be more in accordance with S. Augustin and the other Fathers."

'Lastly, as regards the *form* of the University's oath. They bind themselves thus: "You shall swear that you will maintain the opinion of the Faculty on the Conception of the Immaculate Virgin, namely, that in her Conception she was preserved from original sin." This is the original oath, first published in the year 1497, and republished three times, once in 1560, and twice in 1575. By it they bring themselves into a position of schism with Rome, the Council of Trent, and their own bishop, who took the part of Maldonatus,—they incur the guilt of perjury according to Alexander, "that those oaths which are against public truth and the institutes of the holy Fathers are not to be called oaths but perjuries;"—they set themselves above a General Council—Trent, in taking away a licence which it had granted,—and they give room for its being said that a General Council can err; since Trent rules one thing, and they rule another, and a very different one; and lastly they will compel a defender of the faith to brand themselves with a mark of censure—and so the whole controversy "*ad ignominiam Catholicorum redibit.*"

Such is the language against the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, of one of the most learned and eminent of Romish controversialists. His arguments are in truth what he terms them himself—unanswerable; and they derive the more force from the fact that he is no enemy to the Church whose particular novelty he is opposing, but, on the contrary, he proves himself her honest and genuine disciple; this he does both by the way in which he speaks of the Pope as the head of the whole Church, and of Trent as a General Council, and especially as he identifies the Church Catholic with the Church of Rome. Indeed he carries out this principle so honestly, that while he rejects one phase of Romish doctrine on this subject, he adopts another, viz. the '*Sanctificatio in utero,*' which he does not fear to term the '*primitive tradition,*' but for proof of which, our readers will not fail to observe, that he neither goes further back than the year 1216, nor once looks beyond the pale of Rome.

Can we imagine any of the real and undoubted articles of the Catholic faith being so treated by an opponent, as Launoy treats this? Can the Doctors of the Church of Rome point to a single doctrine on which any primitive Bishops, or the successors of S. Peter, if they will, and the heads of the Universal Church, have so ruled as the modern Popes have done on the Immaculate Conception? And what would have become of Christianity, at its outset, if they could? In fact, we repeat that there have been three different systems on the Blessed Virgin Mary; one, and one only, is that of the early Church interpreting and speaking for Scripture; the other two belong

exclusively to Rome. The first extends down to the times of S. Bernard, and teaches that all the natural descendants of Adam, without one exception, are under sin, both original and actual, and that the Blessed Virgin Mary is not excepted. The second, extending from S. Bernard to Clement XI., holds a Conception indeed in sin, but a perfect cleansing immediately afterwards; and the third and last demands a perfect Immaculateness both in and before the Conception. The first, as we have said, is supported by Holy Writ and the early Saints; the second claims to rest on miracles and miraculous revelations; the third has gradually been evolved from the second, of which it is, in plain terms, a correction and an improvement. What would Rome say were another Church to take on itself so to manufacture a doctrine, producing, after centuries of hesitation, intrigue, internal discord, cavillings, and self-contradictions, a system which, when at length exposed to the light of day, was found to be so utterly hostile to the peculiar prerogative of Him who, condescending to be born of a daughter of Adam, yet was the Son of no earthly father, but was conceived, that His birth should be without spot, even of the Holy Ghost? In such a case she might perhaps claim, with some truth,—with more at least than she can now,—to be the sole representative of our Heavenly Master, and the one depository of His truth on earth.

And as to Perrone's arguments, apart from his proofs, nothing can be conceived more weak and inconclusive! Thus he relies much on Sixtus IV. and the Council of Trent, yet it may be allowed us to say, that something of the contradiction which Launoy proves to exist between these authorities and the University of Paris, is found, in their turn, between Scripture and them. The former plainly says that *all* the children of Adam are under sin; the latter, on the contrary, say that *not* all are so, but that there may be, and is an exception.

Then, as to his conclusion from the words of Job xiv. 4, 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one,'—if it is to be so strictly applied to Christ as the Son of Mary, as to render it necessary that she must have been conceived and born without any stain of sin, that so He might be holy (!)—what becomes of it when she herself is to be born in her turn? and what can it issue in at last but in one of these two alternatives, viz. either that Adam could not have been defiled, or that Mary could not have been purified?

Again, Perrone positively ventures to bring forward, as no weak argument on his side, 'the universal consent of the people even from the time of S. Augustin,' and that in the face of S. Bernard's words, that the doctrine and festival were alike

unheard of before his time; words which, when we consider S. Bernard's own place in the controversy, are most decisive against Perrone; for although, as we have said, it is S. Bernard's name alone that has prevented the primitive doctrine from having been condemned and branded as heresy by the Popes long ago, yet we should remember that he is not to be regarded in it as anything like a champion of the really Catholic faith.

It is to him that the Mediaevalists look, as the support of their doctrine of a 'Sanctificatio in utero,' and he is to be regarded as holding a middle place in the question. Both as compared with the early Fathers and the later Church of Rome, he appears as an antagonist; by the side of the former he is found to have said much more than he was warranted in saying, whilst it is evident that he falls as far short of the full requirements of the latter; and thus, as the only alternative, he holds that mediæval doctrine which is, in fact, the mean between them.

At page 236, Perrone argues thus:—

'That a tradition of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary having once existed in the Church, it could never have been subsequently destroyed, nor could any other have sprung up in its place. But the existence of this doctrine in the present day shows that it must, therefore, have existed always, and that, in consequence, the Bible assertions that all the posterity of Adam were under sin, must have excluded the Blessed Virgin Mary; and the Fathers who opposed Pelagianism, and who also laid down an universal proposition as to his sin attaching to all his posterity, must have admitted the exclusion.'

Yet, a few pages further on (p. 277) he states, but is unable to refute, the assertions of such men as Cajetan, Launoy, and Belarmine, that 'there is no foundation for the "*pia sententia*," so called, either in Sacred Scripture or in Ecclesiastical Tradition; nay, that they both oppose it with sufficient plainness.'

There are, in truth, but two facts to which they appeal with any show of reason for the support of the 'Sanctificatio in utero,' and none whatever to bear out the doctrine of Perrone. These are, firstly, the case of Jeremiah and John the Baptist; and, secondly, the passage of S. Augustin, first quoted by Peter Lombard, that 'in the case of the Blessed Virgin Mary he would rather not entertain any question about sin at all.' For the first, one of their own Popes confesses, as we have seen from Launoy, 'that John and Jeremiah were indeed sanctified before their birth, but that Christ only was conceived without sin;' but the doctrine of a mere 'Sanctificatio' is now positively rejected and condemned by the Church of Rome. For the second, it is surely a very different thing for S. Augustin to say that he would rather not entertain a question, to what it would have been had he plainly declared that the question did not exist to be entertained. It seems to us that his words imply, not the

existence of sinlessness in the Blessed Virgin Mary, but the express contrary; at least, a way to test the question may be, to ask ourselves whether we ourselves should be content to receive, or whether S. Augustin would have thought of giving, such a statement, as sufficient, of the sinlessness of Christ? Yet, according to the Church of Rome, the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin Mary, though of grace only, is as perfect in degree as His.

In fact, the maintenance of the doctrine will involve this Church in numberless difficulties, the results of which cannot probably be yet foreseen. At the outset we have in it a proof that an infallible body (so called) can hold a doctrine so plainly opposed in principle, if not in mere words, to Scripture, that all intelligent minds must see, sooner or later, that the infallibility of one or other must fall. If, too, the Church (of Rome) can err in a doctrine, she can also err as to miracles, and the contrary; and in this case her claim of inerrability must give way, as that of her infallibility is already endangered.

It is, indeed, strictly true, however startling it may appear, that Perrone himself does not trust and act on his own principles, but, without intending it, he gives them up from the very outset. He first claims for the Pope a hyper-œcumenical authority, and immediately after we find him proving a Pope by a Father, then by a Schoolman, and last of all by the mere *vox populi*. Now, with his principles strictly carried out, he should have proved Pope by Pope, and by nothing less, (and how he would succeed in doing so our pages may perhaps afford some slight idea;) to prove a Pope by a Father is, in him, like proving S. Paul or S. John by S. Ignatius or S. Irenæus. In fact, there can be no need, in this case, to appeal even to Scripture itself, and Perrone's whole work is based on a fallacy. He should not have inquired whether the Pope *can* rule the doctrine, but whether he has done, or pleases to do so. In taking leave of Perrone, and the arguments he has brought forward, we cannot forbear calling to his attention the words addressed to him by Pius IX., and of which he seems not a little proud, 'Dum autem tibi, dilecte fili, debitas pro dono agimus gratias, te etiam atque etiam hortamur, ut majore usque alacritate tuas curas cogitationesque in iis potissimum conficiendis impendere pergas, quæ rei tum sacræ tum litterariæ *usui* et ornamento esse possint.'¹

But a graver question remains for us. Whilst the Church of Rome inscribes in the list of her doctrines, and celebrates among her festivals, the Immaculate Conception of any but Christ alone,

¹ Page 2.

and that on no better authority than the dictum of one or two of her Popes, what blame can there be to any National Church, or to any individual, for refusing to hold communion with her? How, too, can those primary questions of the infallibility and perfect unity of that Church and her Pontiffs maintain their ground in the face of Popes, not observing a proper œconomy, or a necessary silence, and, when the time has come, speaking out boldly, plainly, decisively, and once for all,—but abounding in doubts and hesitations, and falling into continual contradictions, both of themselves and of one another? And if these first principles fail, then, however important is the present question in itself, it may become still more so in its results; for it is on them alone, if on anything, that she can demand the submission of other Churches; and if, fairly tested by history, they are found utterly incapable of sustaining the weight that is placed on them, and proved to be simply a nullity—and yet she has no other ground on which to assail us or to deny the claim of the Church in England to be a part of the mystical body of Christ—it may well assure us that we have, in truth, a point of communion, in that Church, with the Apostles, and a position which can bear examination, even on its weakest points, far better than the Church of Rome, with all her boast and assumption of a peculiar infallibility and an unbroken unity, can bear inquiry on such a doctrine as that of the Immaculate Conception.

APPENDIX.

LITTLE OFFICE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

[The text is an exact copy of the Office as published by authority at Rome, in 1838. *Vide* Cœleste Palmetum, p. 243.]

Eja, mea labia, nunc annuntiate
Laudes et præconia Virginis beatæ.

V. Domina, in adiutorium meum intende.
R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.
V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

From Septuagesima to Easter, instead of Alleluia, is said:

Laus tibi, Domine, Rex æternæ gloriæ.

HYMN.

Salve, mundi Domina,
Cœlorum Regina :
Salve, Virgo virginum,
Stella matutina.

Salve, plena gratia,
Clara luce divina :
Mundi in auxilium,
Domina, festina.

Ab æterno Dominus
Te præordinavit
Matrem unigeniti
Verbi, quo creavit

Terram, pontum, æthera :
Te pulchram ornavit
Sibi Sponsam, quæ in
Adam non peccavit. Amen.

- V. Elegit eam Deus, et præelegit eam.
R. In tabernaculo suo habitare fecit eam.
V. Domina, exaudi orationem meam.
R. Et clamor meus ad te veniat.

Oremus.

Sancta Maria, Regina cœlorum, mater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et mundi Domina, quæ nullum derelinquis, et nullum despicias ; respice me, Domina, clementer oculo pietatis, et impetra mihi apud tuum dilectum Filium cunctorum veniam peccatorum : ut qui nunc tuam sanctam et *immaculatam* Conceptionem devoto affectu recolo, æternæ in futurum beatitudinis bravium capiam, ipso, quem virgo peperisti, donante Domino nostro Jesu Christo ; qui cum Patre et Sancto Spiritu vivit et regnat, in Trinitate perfecta Deus in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

- V. Domina, exaudi orationem meam.
R. Et clamor meus ad te veniat.
V. Benedicamus Domino.
R. Deo gratias.
V. Fidelium animæ per misericordiam Dei requiescant in pace.
R. Amen.

AT PRIME.

- V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.
R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.
V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, Virgo sapiens,
Domus Deo dicata,
Columna septemplici
Mensaque exornata.

Ab omni contagio
Mundi præservata :
Ante sancta in utero
Parentis, quam nata.

Tu, Mater viventium,
Et porta es Sanctorum :
Nova stella Jacob,
Domina Angelorum.

Zabulo terribilis
Acies castrorum :
Portus et refugium
Sis Christianorum. Amen.

- V. Ipse creavit illam in Spiritu Sancto.
R. Et effudit illam inter omnia opera sua.
V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (*cum Oratione, ut supra.*)

AT TERCE.

- V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.
R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.
V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, arca fœderis,
Thronus Salomonis,
Arcus pulcher ætheris,
Rubus visionis :

Virga frondens germinis :
Vellus Gedeonis :
Porta clausa numinis,
Favusque Samsonis.

Decebat tam nobilem
Natum, præcavere
Ab originali
Labe Matris Evæ

Almam, quam elegerat,
Genitricem vere,
Nulli prorsus sineus
Culpæ subiacere. Amen.

V. Ego in altissimis habito.

R. Et thronus meus in columna nubis.

V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.)

AT SEXT.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.

R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.

V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, Virgo puerpera,
Templum Trinitatis;
Angelorum gaudium,
Cella puritatis:

Terra es benedicta
Et sacerdotalis,
Sancta et immunis
Culpæ originalis.

Solamen mœrentium,
Hortus voluptatis:
Palma patientiæ,
Cedrus castitatis.

Civitas altissimi,
Porta orientalis:
In te est omnis gratia,
Virgo singularis. Amen.

V. Sicut lilium inter spinas.

R. Sic amica mea inter filias Adæ.

V. Domina exaudi, &c. (p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.)

AT NONE.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.

R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.

V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, urbs refugii,
Turrisque munita
David, propugnaculis
Armisque insignita,

O mulier fortis,
Et invicta Judith!
Pulchra Abisag virgo,
Verum fovens David!

In Conceptione
Charitate ignita,
Draconis potestas
Est a te contrita.

Rachel curatorem
Ægypti gestavit:
Salvatorem mundi
Maria portavit. Amen.

V. Tota pulchra es, amica mea.

R. Et macula originalis nunquam fuit in te.

V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.)

AT VESPERS.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.

R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.

V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, horologium,
Quo retrogradiatur
Sol in decem lineis;
Verbum incarnatur.

Solis hujus radiis
Maria coruscet;
Consurgens aurora
In conceptu micat.

Homo ut ab inferis
Ad summa attollatur,
Immensus ab Angelis
Paulo minoratur.

Lilium inter spinas
Quæ serpentis conterat
Caput: pulchra ut luna
Errantes collustrat. Amen.

V. Ego feci in cœlis, ut oriretur lumen indeficiens.

R. Et quasi nebula texi omnem terram.

V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (*p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.*)

AT COMPLINE.

V. Convertat nos, Domina, tuis precibus placatus Jesus Christus Filius tuus.

R. Et avertat iram suam a nobis.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.

R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.

V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, Virgo florens,

Mater illibata,

Regina clementiæ,

Stellis coronata.

Super omnes Angelos

Pura, immaculata,

Atque ad regis dexteram

Stans veste deaurata.

Per te, Mater gratiæ,

Dulcis spes reorum,

Fulgens stella maris,

Portus naufragorum,

Patens cœli janua,

Salus infirmorum,

Videamus Regem

In aula Sanctorum. Amen.

V. Oleum effusum, Maria, nomen tuum.

R. Servi tui dilexerunt te nimis.

V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (*p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.*)

THE COMMENDATION.

Supplices offerimus

Tibi, Virgo pia,

Hæc laudum præconia;

Fac nos ut in via!

Ducas cursu prospero;

Et in agonia

Tu nobis assiste,

O dulcis Maria.

R. Deo gratias.

There is also a larger Office, (London, Richardson & Son, 1849;) and we beg our readers to observe, that whilst even Clement, in 1708, although certainly implying that the Conception in itself was Immaculate, only ventured to use that term of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. do not hesitate to apply it to the Conception. The language of the first of these Popes is 'festum Conceptionis Beatæ Mariæ Virginis immaculatæ;' that of the two last, 'Tuam sanctam et immaculatam Conceptionem recolo.'—Lesser Office, A.D. 1838. 'Immaculata Conceptio est hodie Sanctæ Mariæ Virginis.'—Greater Office, 1848. Moreover, the wide difference of language applied to the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Fathers from whom the homilies for that Festival are taken, S. Ambrose, S. Bernard, S. Chrysostom, S. John Damascenes, &c., and that used in the Office itself, is also very remarkable.

THE following list of authors who have treated of this subject may be found useful by those who wish to investigate the question for themselves.

S. Bernard.—Letter to the Canons of Lyons. Letter 174 (and Benedictine note), p. 169, &c. Vol. i. fol. Paris. 1719. And three Sermons on the Assumption. Ditto, p. 1001, &c.

Peter Lombard.—Book of Sentences, Book iii. Distinction 3. On which the chief commentators are—

Century 13.

Alexander of Hales (Franciscan).—*Summa Theologiæ*, No. 2, Article 2.

Bonaventura, his pupil (Franciscan).—Book iii. Dist. 3. Quest. 1.

Albertus Magnus (Dominican).—Book iii. Dist. 3. Art. 3.

S. Thomas Aquinas, his pupil (Dominican.)—On Book ii. of the Sentences, Dist. 31. Quest. 1. Art. 2; and Book iii. Quest. 1; and Summa Theologiæ, Quest. 27. Art. 1.

Century 14.

John Duns Scotus (Franciscan.)—On Book iii. Dist. 3. Quest. 1. Scotus' doctrine on the particular question of the Immaculate Conception is much the same as those of the Schoolmen named above;—where he really does differ from them being, that he goes much further than they do in asserting the perfect Impeccability of the Blessed Virgin Mary, both as to mortal and venial sin: they all allowing with S. Chrysostom, or rather not venturing to deny, the possibility of at least the latter.

John Montesonus.—Theses; in Alexander Natalis, vol. xx. 8vo. Paris. A.D. 1684.

Bulæus.—History of the University of Paris. Tom. ii.

Mabillon.—Annales Benedictini. Tom. vi.

Wadding (Franciscan).—Annales Minorum, Centuries 13 and 14.

Alexander Natalis (Dominican).—Centuries 13 and 14.

Launoy (Jansenist).—Two Prescriptions, pp. 43, in vol. i. of his Works. Folio, Cologne. 1731.

Calixtus, Ulrici, 4to. Helmstadt, A.D. 1696. These, except Wadding, are all strenuous opposers of the Immaculate Conception.

Corpus Juris Canonici.

Bullarium of Cherubini, Tom. ii. iii. vi, and that of Rome, A.D. 1735, which is more copious. In these we find the rules of the following Popes on the question:—

Sixtus IV.'s Constitutions 'Cum præcelsa,' A.D. 1476–7, and 'Grave nimis,' 1483. These are in the Corpus Juris Canonici, and they were renewed by the Council of Trent at the end of its 'Decretum de Originali Peccato.'

Pius V.—Bull 'Quod a nobis,' 1568, and 'Super speculum,' 1570.

Paul V.—'Regis Pacifici,' 1616.

Gregory XV.—'Sanctissimus Dominus Noster,' 1622.

Alexander VII.—'Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum,' 1661.

These five Popes and the Council of Trent left the question altogether undecided; but soon after Alexander VII., we find Clement XI., in his Bull, 'Commissi nobis,' ordering that the festival of the Immaculate Conception (properly so called) should be celebrated every year.

The works of Gonzalez and Perrone, both Jesuits, are remarkable as showing a fatal difference of *first principles*, on the doctrine, between their respective authors.

And lastly, Mr. Morris, late Fellow of Exeter College, has lately published two volumes octavo, under the title of 'Jesus, the Son of Mary,' the second of which treats, among other things, of the Immaculate Conception: but his work differs in no respect from others on the same side of the question, either in the kind of proofs adduced by him for the doctrine, or in their cogency of application.

The early Fathers of the Church, who contended firstly for our Lord's true Humanity, and afterwards for the doctrine of Grace—S. Irenæus and Tertullian against the Gnostics; S. Athanasius, the two Gregories, of Nazianzum and Nyssa, with S. Basil, against Apollinaris; and S. Augustin against Julian and the Pelagians—may be useful as affording an *indirect* evidence against the modern Romish doctrine, and indeed even that of S. Bernard, by showing that they included the Blessed Virgin Mary in the penalty of Adam's fall, *by nature*, and did not exclude her from it through her *personal privilege* as the mother of our Lord.

✠ A copious list of authorities, in addition to the above, will be found in the Bibliotheca of Walchius.

ART. IV.—*Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli*. 3 vols. London : Bentley. 1852.

A POPULAR novelist has satirised with some asperity the American love of celebrities, and the habit of each little Transatlantic circle to attribute to its favourites a world-wide fame, so that the country may be said to abound, nay, even to swarm, with 'remarkable' and 'distinguished' men. The present volumes furnish us with a portrait of a remarkable American woman, and so really distinguished for certain gifts, and for their high appreciation by her countrymen, and for the part she took in Italian politics, that we doubt not her name is already familiar to some congenial English coteries, though we take no shame to ourselves that hitherto it has been no household word with us, nor, we would venture to guess, with most of our readers. We never heard of Margaret Fuller, nor of her Italian development as Margaret Fuller Ossoli, till these volumes placed her before us, with all the skill at portraying character three American writers, of some eminence in their peculiar school, could command. Mr. J. Freeman Clarke, Mr. Emerson, Mr. W. E. Channing, assisted by slighter sketches from other hands, have succeeded in drawing a portrait, in giving us an idea, in placing a very singular woman distinctly enough before us. As the muse, the priestess, and, *we* would add, the victim, of their system of philosophy, she called for this at their hands; and it has been a work of love to them all. That philosophy which would take the world by storm, as a new discovery,—a sign of progress and emancipation,—a development of the refined and purified human reason,—but to which Bacon assigns a much earlier origin, placing it at the head and beginning, indeed, of all systems which have misled mankind, where he says, (in defining the nature of that desire for knowledge which led to the Fall,) that 'an aspiring desire to attain to that part of moral knowledge which defineth of good and evil, *whereby to dispute God's commandments, and not to depend upon the revelation of His will*, was 'the original temptation.' A 'desire' which characterises all the writers worshipped by Margaret Fuller, and forming her mind; and the distinguishing feature of her own philosophic system. Where persons renounce creeds, and deem themselves superior to forms, and estimate religion in proportion to its vagueness,—holding it the purer for owning no object, and the deeper for having no base,—they are necessarily thrown back upon their own and kindred minds for something definite to extol and care for. Their own speculations, their own thoughts, become the true objects of their devotion, from the necessity which exists

in our nature for something positive to rest upon; and thus we find in this school of philosophy a universal tendency to hero-worship. Each professor of it sets up a pantheon of his own, as a sort of *locum tenens* of the evanescent deity which they profess to acknowledge, but which, 'peradventure sleeping, or on a journey,' eludes the mind's grasp. And as Lord Bacon has furnished us with a definition of the motive principle of the system, so does he aptly describe the consequences of this worship of the human reason, from whatever cause. 'Another error,' he says, 'hath proceeded from too great reverence, and a kind of 'adoration of the mind and understanding of man; by means 'whereof men have withdrawn themselves too much from the 'contemplation of nature and the observations of experience, and 'have tumbled up and down in their own reasons and conceits; ' . . . for they disdain to spell, and so, by degrees, to read, in 'the volume of God's works, and contrariwise, by continual 'meditation and agitation of wit, do urge, and, as it were, invoke, 'their own spirits to divine and give oracles unto them, whereby 'they are deservedly deluded.' The present volumes furnish one out of many painful illustrations of the truth of this picture—this invocation of the spirit to divine and give oracles, and this 'tumbling up and down' of the reason and conceit, and the consequent delusion. It would be easy enough to draw a simply repulsive picture of this 'Yankee Corinne,' with plain features, nasal tones, arrogant manners; this egotistical, self-confident, clever woman; this socialistic, transcendental unbeliever; this despiser of social order; this contemner of creeds; this shallow scorner of deep truths: it would be easy, we say, and every word might be vouched for by testimony of her friends recorded in these volumes; but it would not be true, for it would not be the whole truth. It would not be fair to represent her as, in fact, repulsive, for such she was not to those who knew her; and we can quite understand *why* she was not, though this catalogue of repelling qualities would justly lead all wise people to keep out of the sphere of her attractions.

Women are no originators of systems: we may pity, therefore, while we blame, this female genius, so early caught in the snare of Rousseau and Goethe, and so many other masculine offenders, for whom her education and unduly developed intellect made her so ready a prey. But instead of generalising, for which we have little space, we will present our readers with a slight sketch of Margaret's life and thoughts, which the present work, in spite of the bias of the writers, very fairly presents us with.

She was born in 1810 at Cambridge Port, Massachusetts, and was the daughter of Timothy Fuller, a lawyer and politician—

himself a scholar, and, according to the place and time, a good one, but never winning his daughter's intellectual respect, and, indeed, scarcely deserving it, as his early system of education cost her dear. Seeing her powers, he chose to educate her himself, and seems to have quite deliberately set to work to make her a prodigy. He overtasked her mind by the nature and quantity of the work he gave it; and, to make matters worse, being engaged in other avocations all day, put off his little daughter's lessons till late in the evening, and sometimes till really late at night—a system of child-murder which, we hope, could hardly find a parallel or example in the present day. She constantly went to bed several hours too late, and was so haunted when she lay down in it by nightmare, spectral illusions, and somnambulism, that sometimes she could scarcely be persuaded to go to bed at all. Thus, she complains, the harmonious development and growth of her bodily powers was checked, and the seeds of subsequent headache, weakness, and nervous affections of all kinds laid up for her whole life. This was her father's fault; but one of her friends drops a curious hint of a youthful weakness of her own, a taste for tight-lacing, strangely at variance with the masculine sense attributed to this 'large-brained woman,' which may have helped on these engrafted infirmities of constitution. She did not go mad, she says, under this strange management. 'Her mind had too much strength to be crushed,' and she acquired in her childhood sufficient accurate knowledge of Latin and its classics, and some Greek. Nature had given her a taste for the beautiful, which her 'ugly' home and her father's utilitarian views made it difficult for her to indulge; but there was a row of elms and a cultivated garden to feed these instincts, and out of the window of her father's library (within which she was introduced at the same time and at a very early age to Shakspeare, Cervantes, and Molière) she could watch the setting sun.

Full of what she took for Roman and Shakspearian visions of majesty and beauty, the poor child acquired a great contempt for such homely specimens of human nature as a New England village supplied her with. She owns to a profound 'odious' contempt for all her neighbours, more especially when she beheld them all assembled together in the village church. America is so destitute of antiquities, heroic traditions, and all that feeds the romance of childhood, that we may sympathise a little with even the uncivil consequences of unsatisfied yearnings for them, and enter besides into the delight with which she found a temporary contentment. We are not accustomed to see *romance* in elegance and propriety of deportment, in *cultivation* in fact; but to a child's imagination, debarred from acquaintance with them, and asso-

ciating these qualities with the old world and its histories, we can quite understand how a well-bred English lady, beheld for the first time, should be surrounded with the sort of halo with which our infancy invested the heroines of chivalry or the princesses of fairy land. She was in the said village church when,

‘As my eye was ranging about with its accustomed coldness, and the proudly foolish sense of being in a shroud of thoughts that were not their thoughts, it was arrested by a face most fair, and well-known, as it seemed at first glance—for surely I had met her before, and waited for her long. But soon I saw that she was a new apparition foreign to that scene, if not to me. Her dress—the arrangement of her hair, which had the graceful pliancy of races highly cultivated for long,—the intelligent and full picture of her eye, whose reserve was in its self-possession, not in timidity—all combined to make up a whole impression, which, though too young to understand, I was well prepared to feel. . . . She was an English lady, who, by a singular chance, was cast upon this region for a few months. Elegant and captivating, her every look and gesture was tuned to a different pitch from anything I had ever known. She was in various ways “accomplished,” as it is called, though to what degree I cannot now judge. She painted in oils;—I had never before seen any one use the brush, and days would not have been too long for me to watch the pictures growing beneath her hand. She played the harp: and its tones are still to me the heralds of the promised land I saw before me then. She rose, she looked, she spoke; and the gentle swaying motion she made, all through life has gladdened memory, as the stream does the woods and meadows. . . . Her mind was sufficiently unoccupied to delight in my warm devotion. She could not know what it was to me, but the light cast by the flame through so delicate a vase cheered and charmed her. All who saw her admired her in their way; but she would lightly turn her head from their hard or oppressive looks, and fix a glance of full-eyed sweetness on the child, who, from a distance, watched all her looks and motions. She did not say much to me—not much to any one; she spoke in her whole being rather than by chosen words. . . . We walked in the fields, alone. Though others were present, her eyes were gliding over all the field and plain for the objects of beauty to which she was of kin. She was not cold to her seeming companions; a sweet courtesy satisfied them, but it hung about her like her mantle that she wore without thinking of it; her thoughts were free, for these civilized beings can live really two lives at the same moment. With them she seemed to be, but her hand was given to the child at her side; others did not observe me, but to her I was the only human presence. Like a guardian spirit she led me through the fields and groves, and every tree, every bird greeted me, and said, what I felt, “She is the first angel of your life.”—Vol. i. pp. 34—38.

This is a pretty picture and a youthful enthusiasm well described, and it is only justice to Margaret, who issued in so terribly strong-minded a woman, to explain that she differed through life from her strong-minded sisterhood in this one particular,—in full sympathy with and love for the society of her own sex. She liked her girlish companions because they were beautiful, though she was plain. She had a prodigious number of female friendships; she laid herself out to emancipate the female mind from its trammels, real or more likely fancied; and she

brought out all her store of fascinations in their company, and for their sake alone—to win them, to make an impression upon them; and she was rewarded by a very enthusiastic lover-like devotion from all the most admired and courted beauties of her acquaintance.

About this time she was sent to school at Boston, to Dr. Park's seminary for young ladies. She has given, under a feigned name, her confessions, for so they must be called, of this somewhat unsatisfactory period of her life, when she fell into the temporary sin of mischief-making and tale-bearing amongst her school-fellows, out of revenge for tricks and satire which her peculiarities brought upon her. She must have been a strange wild creature, full of genius, and excitable to extravagance, having a propensity to *spin* like a dancing dervish; at the end of a whirl being inspired to great feats of declamation and acting, 'sometimes stimulating her to convulse the hearers with laughter, sometimes to melt them to tears.' She had a whimsical turn for eccentricities of dress and theatrical draperies, and on occasion of some private theatricals was so taken by the effect of rouge on her good looks, that she persisted in adopting it as a practice, which tells rather oddly for the discipline of Dr. Park's establishment. Her school-fellows, however, broke her of this fancy by a harmless practical joke as it might have appeared, but which so wounded the pride of our heroine's nature that it nearly cost her her life. Highly instructed, feared, and loved, and altogether wondered at, she left school at sixteen, to enter again into society, in which she had previously taken a woman's stand; for we are told at thirteen she was so precocious in physical and mental development, that she passed for eighteen or twenty, and she had her place in society as a lady full-grown. At sixteen she was an established star in her own circle:—

'In our evening reunions,' says the Rev. F. H. Hedge, 'of this and a few subsequent years, she was always conspicuous by the brilliancy of her wit, which needed but little provocation to break forth in exuberant sallies, that drew around her a knot of listeners, and made her the central attraction of the hour. Rarely did she enter a company in which she was not a prominent object.'—Vol. i. p. 19.

Elsewhere he speaks of her early tendency to sarcasm:—

'As she advanced in life, she learned to control that tendency to sarcasm,—that disposition to "quiz,"—which was then somewhat excessive. It frightened shy young people from her presence, and made her, for a while, notoriously unpopular with the ladies of her circle.'—Vol. i. p. 116.

'I have spoken of her conversational talent. It continued to develop in these years, and was certainly her most decided gift. One could form no adequate idea of her ability without hearing her converse. She did many things well, but nothing so well as she talked. It is the opinion of all her friends that her writings do her very imperfect justice. For some reason or other, she could never deliver herself in print as she did with her

lips. She required the stimulus of attentive ears and answering eyes to bring out all her power. She must have her auditory about her. Her conversation, as it was then, I have seldom heard equalled. It was not so much attractive as commanding. Though remarkably fluent and select, it was neither fluency, nor choice diction, nor wit, nor sentiment, that gave it its peculiar power; but accuracy of statement, keen discrimination, and a certain weight of judgment which contrasted strongly and charmingly with the youth and sex of the speaker. I do not remember that the vulgar charge of talking "like a book" was ever fastened upon her, although, by her precision, she might seem to have incurred it. The fact was, her speech, though finished and true as the most deliberate rhetoric of the pen, had always an air of spontaneity which made it seem the grace of the moment,—the result of some organic provision that made finished sentences as natural to her as blundering and hesitation are to most of us. With a little more imagination, she would have made an excellent improvisatrice.'—Vol. i. pp. 120, 121.

It was with this dangerous gift, with a singular power of seizing at once and using as if it had long been her own every new thought and idea that books or other minds were presenting to her, that Margaret was at this time forming her opinions and filling her head with all the theories—French and German—that an insatiable love of reading and a resolute industry could find time for. She was in a perpetual excitement of success, fed by the consciousness of possessing high intellect, and appropriating with delight every external influence that ministered to her diseased mental activity. 'Blessed be the early days,' she says somewhere, 'when I sat at the feet of Rousseau, prophet 'sad and stately as any of Jewry! Every 'onward movement of the age, every downward step into the solemn depths 'of my own soul, recalls thy oracles, O Jean Jacques!' But we do not intend to inflict many of these rhapsodies upon our readers. The fearful picture of a girl of 16 or 20 for ever reading books which some kind friend should have withheld from her, for ever talking on subjects she should not have been encouraged to open her lips upon, and urged on by general attention and admiration which might have turned older heads than hers, is one more for sorrow than anger. As far as we can gather, her father, proud of her talents, left her very much to her own discretion. Once we find him forbidding her when a child to read plays and romances on Sunday; and a few years later she considers it a great grievance that she must go to church—whatever this 'Church' might have been—on Thanksgiving Day (she had quite discontinued her Sunday attendance), or seriously offend her father. Here his authority seems to have stopped: and yet his mother was apparently of the more rigid Puritan school. She describes her on one occasion as a venerable old lady always reading the 'Saints' Rest.' Perhaps these gradations of faith, 'fine by degrees and

beautifully less,' may not be uncommon. In thinking of a woman, we always like to have some idea of her personal appearance. Mr. Hedge is the most favourable reporter on this head:—

'When I recal her personal appearance then (at 13), and for ten or twelve years subsequent to this, I have the idea of a blooming girl of a florid complexion and vigorous health, with a tendency to robustness, of which she was painfully conscious, and which, with little regard to hygienic principles, she endeavoured to suppress or conceal, thereby preparing for herself much future suffering. With no pretensions to beauty then, or at any time, her face was one that attracted, that awakened a lively interest, that made one desirous of a nearer acquaintance. It was a face that fascinated, without satisfying. . . . I said she had no pretensions to beauty. Yet she was not plain. She escaped the reproach of positive plainness, by her blond and abundant hair, by her excellent teeth, by her sparkling, dancing, busy eyes, which, though usually half closed from near-sightedness, shot piercing glances at those with whom she conversed, and, most of all, by the very peculiar and graceful carriage of her head and neck, which all who knew her will remember as the most characteristic trait in her personal appearance.'—Vol. i. pp. 115, 116.

Mr. Hedge is the friend of her youth; he introduced her to Mr. Emerson when she was 26, who has also given his impression. Mr. Emerson when in the vein can rhapsodise with any man; but this has not been his line in these pages, in which they differ favourably from other portions of the work. On the contrary, they are marked by a straightforward, rather amusing candour. He takes the bull by the horns, and while he wishes to make us end with an extraordinary admiration and veneration for Margaret, he does not shrink from the honest task of making the reader a sharer in all the difficulties which her friends had to encounter in their first acquaintance. He says:—

'I still remember the first half-hour of Margaret's conversation. She was then 26 years old. She had a face and frame that would indicate fulness and tenacity of life. She was rather under the middle height; her complexion was fair, with strong fair hair. She was then, as always, carefully and becomingly dressed, and of ladylike self-possession. For the rest, her appearance had nothing prepossessing. Her extreme plainness,—a trick of incessantly opening and shutting her eyelids,—the nasal tone of her voice,—all repelled; and I said to myself, we shall never get far. It is to be said, that Margaret made a disagreeable first impression on most persons, including those who became afterwards her best friends, to such an extreme that they did not wish to be in the same room with her. This was partly the effect of her manners, which expressed an overweening sense of power, and slight esteem for others, and partly the prejudice of her fame. She had a dangerous reputation for satire, in addition to her great scholarship. The men thought she carried too many guns, and the women did not like one who despised them. I believe I fancied her too much interested in personal history; and her talk was a comedy in which dramatic justice was done to everybody's foibles. I remember that she made me laugh more than I liked; for I was, at that time, an eager scholar of ethics, and had tasted the sweets of solitude and stoicism, and I found

something profane in the hours of amusing gossip into which she drew me, and when I returned to my library had much to think of the crackling of thorns under a pot.'—Vol. i. pp. 268, 269.

On the arrogance which characterised her he is equally candid:—

'Margaret at first astonished and repelled us by a complacency that seemed the most assured since the days of Scaliger. She spoke, in the quietest manner, of the girls she had formed, the young men who owed everything to her, the fine companions she had long ago exhausted. In the coolest way, she said to her friends, "I now know all the people worth knowing in America, and I find no intellect comparable to my own." In vain, on one occasion, I professed my reverence for a youth of genius, and my curiosity in his future,—"O no, she was intimate with his mind, and I spoiled him, by overrating him." Meantime, we knew that she neither had seen, nor would see, his subtle superiorities.'—Vol. ii. pp. 1, 2.

He then relates that she herself had from the beginning of life idealized herself as a sovereign, and had felt herself in childhood so intellectually superior to all around her, that she had believed herself not her parents' child, but an European princess confided to their care; and in a letter to a female friend she says, 'I take my natural position always: and the more I see, the more I feel that it is regal. Without throne, sceptre, or guards, still a queen.'

'It is certain,' says Mr. Emerson, 'that Margaret occasionally let slip, with all the innocence imaginable, some phrase betraying the presence of a rather mountainous ME, in a way to surprise those who knew her good sense. She could say, as if she were stating a scientific fact, in enumerating the merits of somebody, "He appreciates me." . . . I remember she once said to me, what I heard as a mere statement of fact, and nowise as unbecoming, that "no man gave such invitation to her mind as to tempt her to a full expression; that she felt a power to enrich her thought with such wealth and variety of embellishment as would, no doubt, be tedious to such as she conversed with."—Vol. ii. pp. 3, 4.

On the subject of education, she records in her journal that she had said:—

'I am really old on this subject. In near eight years' experience, I have learned as much as others would in eighty, from my great talent at explanation, tact in the use of means, and immediate and invariable power over the minds of my pupils.'—Vol. ii. pp. 4, 5.

Again:—

'With the intellect I always have, always shall, overcome; but that is not the half of the work. The life, the life! O, my God! shall the life never be sweet?'—Vol. ii. p. 5.

Elsewhere we find the following *naïve* confession, and subsequent aspiration:—

'My fault is that I think, I feel *too much*. O that my friends would teach me that "simple art of not too much!" How can I expect them to bear the ceaseless eloquence of my nature!'—Vol. ii. p. 300.

And again, speaking of some friend whom she had loved,—

‘She loved me, too, though not so much, because her nature was “less high, less grave, less large, less deep.”’—Vol. ii. p. 71.

Our readers must bear in mind that Margaret was not a Christian, of which we shall shortly proceed to give proofs enough in her own words. She is, therefore, alien from us; but the fact must not tell both ways. We must not say she was proud and a heathen, but ‘she was not a Christian, therefore, she was proud.’ There are touches here and there, in spite of the prodigious ‘swelling’ of this self-esteem, confessions, which might be germs of true humility in the converted and renewed heart. It is a favourite notion—taken for granted, indeed, in our youth—that great minds,—minds of power, genius, influence,—minds that have weight over ourselves,—whose works tell upon their fellow-men,—whom to know is a point in most men’s history, are, by virtue of their greatness, humble. Self-esteem is little. We despise it when we detect it. It is grand to forget self; to sparkle, to irradiate, to overflow, to dazzle, delight, inform others, and be all the while unconscious, simple, natural like other men. It *is* grand, but it is the rarest of all intellectual phenomena. Deep men, men of genius and of poetic inspiration, have the gift to know their gift just as consciously ‘as maidens that are young and fair.’ Humility is a Christian grace, and a very difficult one to maintain under the consciousness of a superior intellect; and we fear this poor Margaret’s tumid unblushing self-estimation is but a caricature of many a higher genius’s private hidden musings. Such examples of the weakness of our nature have a higher use than simply to be laughed at; they may teach other men under the same temptations a practical lesson.

Mr. Emerson has not shrunk from betraying his friend’s imperfections. It is certainly remarkable that with these qualities so conspicuous, upon a first acquaintance she should yet have won such a strong hold over the hearts and affections of so many as we must believe that she did. This is, indeed, the strange power of genius, the power to win the love of other minds in spite of themselves; so that we are assured none could resist her fascination, when she chose to exert it. And, in truth, she had a very wide sympathy with her fellows, and an intense curiosity and desire to be acquainted with them,—to know each mind that came in her way,—to be beloved by it,—to be necessary, in a certain sense, to it. It was an attraction that few could resist, and a quality as precious as it is rare, we would add, with a professed fine talker.

'Margaret possessed,' says Mr. J. F. Clarke, 'in a greater degree than any person I ever knew, the power of so magnetizing others, when she wished, by the power of her mind, that they would lay open to her all the secrets of their nature. She had an infinite curiosity to know individuals,—not the vulgar curiosity which seeks to find out the circumstances of their outward lives, but that which longs to understand the inward springs of thought and action in their souls. This desire and power both rested on a profound conviction of her mind in the individuality of every human being.'—Vol. i. pp. 78, 79.

Another, remembering, years after, the effect of her conversation on himself, says:—

"No one ever came so near. Her mood applied itself to the mood of her companion, point to point, in the most limber, sinuous, vital way, and drew out the most extraordinary narratives; yet she had a light sort of laugh, when all was said, as if she thought she could live over that revelation. And this sufficient sympathy she had for all persons indifferently,—for lovers, for artists, and beautiful maids, and ambitious young statesmen, and for old aunts, and coach-travellers. Ah! she applied herself to the mood of her companion, as the sponge applies itself to water." The description tallies well enough with my observation. I remember she found, one day, at my house, her old friend Mr. —, sitting with me. She looked at him attentively, and hardly seemed to know him. In the afternoon, he invited her to go with him to Cambridge. The next day she said to me, "You fancy that you know —. It is too absurd; you have never seen him. When I found him here, sitting like a statue, I was alarmed, and thought him ill. You sit with courteous, *unconfiding* smile, and suppose him to be a mere man of talent. He is so with you. But the moment I was alone with him, he was another creature; his manner, so glassy and elaborate before, was full of soul, and the tones of his voice entirely different." And I have no doubt that she saw expressions, heard tones, and received thoughts from her companions, which no one else ever saw or heard from the same parties, and that her praise of her friends, which seemed exaggerated, was her exact impression. We were all obliged to recal Margaret's testimony, when we found we were sad blockheads to other people."—Vol. ii. pp. 112, 113.

This sympathy is creditable in a professed talker, and we need hardly wonder at her popularity if she used her gifts not so much for display, as for the arousing and developing the minds she came in contact with. 'She made her companion,' says one, 'think more of himself and of common life than of herself.' Perhaps there is no social pleasure more exquisite than the sense of being for a moment lifted above our actual selves by some vigorous and congenial mind. Margaret often, it is true, lifted her friends into very prejudicial flights; but this was the fault, not of her natural gift of sympathy, but of her pernicious opinions. She was the depository of innumerable love stories. Every one told her, as it were, by a sort of fascination, the romance of his life. Even the housemaids, after she had been visiting in a house for a day or two, were led to reveal their humble experience; and coach travellers the same. She is complimented by her biographers for her fidelity in

keeping all these secrets; and though her talk was of people, and she excelled in personal histories, she never betrayed a confidence. The present work, at least, betrays none. One exception proves the rule, and for its brevity we will give this one specimen of a Yankee courtship:—

‘This afternoon we met Mr. — in his wood; and he sat down and told us the story of his life, his courtship, and painted the portraits of his father and mother with most amusing *naïveté*. He said:—“How do you think I offered myself? I never had told Miss — that I loved her; never told her she was handsome; and I went to her, and said, ‘Miss —, I’ve come to offer myself; but first I’ll give you my character. I’m very poor; you’ll have to work: I’m very cross and irascible; you’ll have everything to bear: and I’ve liked many other pretty girls. Now what do you say?’ and she said, ‘I’ll have you:’ and she’s been everything to me.”—Vol. ii. p. 114.

She was remarkable, too, for a very resolute line of truth and candour towards her friends. She could confound and yet not alienate persons by the severity with which she would tell them their faults, of which, if our space allowed, we would give some instances. Mr. Emerson dwells on what he calls her aggressive truth,—her power of dealing with falsehood in a decisive way,—of setting it down, so that people were afraid to be false before her. ‘In great and in small matters, she was a woman of her word, and gave those who conversed with her the unspeakable comfort that flows from plain dealing.’

But now, to leave for a time the more cheerful view of a remarkable character. Let us turn to the principles which influenced and guided it. There can hardly be anything more melancholy than the picture of one mind, especially if that mind be a woman’s, which these separate portraits show us. In all the intellectual tumult and unwholesome activity in which Margaret and her friends sustained and encouraged one another, there is so little to rest upon, so little to *her*, we are glad to say, of solid satisfaction. She never knew what she lacked; perhaps she refused to see, but there is always a sense of want increasing and darkening her path the further she proceeds upon it, but never apparently issuing into even the faintest dawn of a clearer day. We must put together some specimens of her mind on this subject:—

‘Though I reverence,’ she says, ‘all religions as necessary to the happiness of man, I am yet ignorant of the religion of Revelation.’—Vol. i. p. 177.

‘Describing,’ says Mr. J. F. Clarke, ‘a conversation in relation to Christianity with a friend of strong mind, who told her he had found in this religion a home for his best and deepest thoughts, she says, “Ah, what a pleasure to meet with such a daring, yet realizing mind as his!” but her catholic taste found satisfaction in intercourse with persons quite different from herself.’—Vol. i. pp. 134, 135.

At another time we find her using a less declared tone,

as where she says in the following passage, descriptive of the society she lived in, and of her *want* at this time,—

‘My object is to examine thoroughly, as far as my time and abilities will permit, the evidences of the Christian religion. I have endeavoured to get rid of this task as much and as long as possible; to be content with superficial notions, and, if I may so express it, to adopt religion as a matter of taste. But I meet with infidels very often; two or three of my particular friends are deists; and their arguments, with distressing sceptical notions of my own, are haunting me for ever. I must satisfy myself; and having once begun, I shall go on as far as I can. My mind often swells with thoughts on these subjects, which I long to pour out on some person of superior calmness and strength, and fortunate in more accurate knowledge.’—Vol. i. pp. 196, 197.

The following deliberate opinion on a special providence will often recur to the reader of these volumes as accounting for the melancholy, and sense of failure, which are conspicuous in her reviews of her life. She really was without this belief. She talks of Destiny and Fate, contending with her and being against her, in a way often to make us realize what it is not to be a Christian:—

‘Although I do not believe in a Special Providence regulating outward events, and could not reconcile such a belief with what I have seen of life, I do not the less believe in the paternal government of a Deity.’—Vol. i. p. 260.

In her journal we meet with the following curious announcement:—

‘*Sunday, July 1838.*—I partook for the first time of the Lord’s Supper. I had often wished to do so, but had not been able to find a Clergyman, —from whom I could be willing to receive it, —willing to admit me on my own terms.’—Vol. i. p. 263.

What these terms were she does not explain, but she goes on highly to compliment—and we dare say not without good reason—the *liberality* of the ‘Clergyman,’ Mr. H——, on this occasion. Perhaps the following description of a young lady does not sound so strangely in America as it would with us, where Mr. Emerson says:—

‘She had had a circle of young women who were devoted to her, and who had described her “as a wonder of intellect, who had yet no religion.”’—Vol. i. p. 272.

This would by no means be her own definition of herself—she thought she had a great deal of religion; we rather say she had no Christianity. The following gives a singular view of this sense of emptiness which she could not but be aware of in herself. We must do her the justice to say that she is never satisfied with the state of things she voluntarily chose,—not so satisfied with it as those who thought with her.

‘It is true, the present deadness and emptiness summon us to turn our thoughts in that direction (“faithful solitary intentness of spirit”). Being

now without any positive form of religion, any unattractive symbols, or mysterious rites, we are in the less danger of stopping at surfaces. . . . And when I see how little there is to impede and bewilder us, I cannot but accept,—should it be for many years,—the forlornness, the want of fit expression, the darkness as to what is to be expressed even, that characterise our time. But I do not, therefore, as some of our friends do, believe that it will be always so.'—Vol. ii. p. 280.

In her 'credo,' she desires not to be profane in her mention of the one great object of Christian faith; and says, 'Few believe more in His history than myself, and it is very dear to me;' and again, 'I believe in my own way, in the long preparation of His coming;' and concludes thus liberally:—

'I will not loathe sects, persuasions, systems, though I cannot abide in them one moment, for I see that by most men they are still needed. To them their banners, their tents; let them be fireworshippers, platonists, Christians; let them live in the shadow of past revelations.'—Vol. ii. p. 292.

Along with this scepticism she had a great deal of superstition—she had notions of Dæmoniacal influence in a sense of her own, or rather of Goethe's, and imagines herself to have an evil genius, who often thwarts her plans and hinders her doing her best,—her *intellectual* best, it should be understood. However, at another time she takes an opposite line, and complains that 'the Dæmons are not busy enough at the births of most men.' And elsewhere we find this profane rhapsody, in complaining that friendship will not do for her what God alone can: 'Give an answer to my questions, Dæmon! Give a *rock* for my feet.'

It must be owned that Margaret's own musings and reflections are too much tinctured by such flights as these,—are too wild, visionary, and marked by the language of her school, to sustain the character for sense and reason which her biographers claim for her: feeling a sort of interest in her we are often ashamed of them, apart from the errors which lie at the bottom, and solely for the heady exaltation with which they are expressed. Mr. Emerson is not without consciousness of these faults in others, nor unwilling to admit them in her case. Yet some excuse for want of reason may be found for a mind with religious instincts such as she had, yet without an object to anchor them upon. She wanted a guide, but was too arrogant, and perhaps, too, not well circumstanced to find one; and so she invoked her own spirit to give oracles, and to divine on the nearest model of the Pythoness that her genius could suggest.

Yet all the while, in her own course of action, Margaret was practical, and acted up with some severity of principle to her own ideas of duty. When her father died, leaving his family but ill provided for, she resolutely renounced cherished schemes to devote herself to the comfort and support of her mother and the younger members of her family. It had long been arranged

that she should visit Europe, a plan which she had thought necessary for the full education and development of her mind, yet she steadily resisted even the entreaties of her mother, that she should apply her share of her father's property for this purpose, and remained at home, devoting herself with energy and success to practical business, for which she had the greatest natural distaste. She began in a sensible manner to make use of her talents, persevered for some years in teaching, and really succeeded in all she undertook. She was kind and generous too, and almost too liberal of her hard-earned dollars, bestowing them sometimes, from impulses of compassion, on undeserving objects; bearing with a very magnanimous resignation the failure of her good intentions. Her own conduct, too, from what we can learn, was without reproach, which, though slight praise in itself, should yet be recorded of one whose ideas of morality were founded on another principle altogether from God's commandments. A great many of the people she admired and accepted as teachers led bad lives, especially the French and German illuminati, male and female, who had formed and fed her mind. She has an amusing, though truly odious phraseology towards their outrages of morality and decency, and calls them *obstructions*. 'Why am I to love my friend the less,' she asks, 'for any obstruction in his life?' And again, where, in opposition to the rule of judging men by their fruits, she makes her own judgment her sole guide:—'Great, and even *fatal* errors (so far as this life is concerned) could not destroy any friendship for one in whom I am sure of the kernel of nobleness.' All the world knows what 'obstructions' have impeded the life of George Sand. All her works had long been prime favourites with Margaret, and so when she at length visits Europe, she goes to see her in Paris, and passes over her sins with a very revolting indifference. She is struck at first sight with the *goodness* that pervaded her expression, and thus speculates upon her life:—

'To me the truth seems to be this. She has that purity in her soul, for she knows well how to love and prize its beauty; but she herself is quite another sort of person. She needs no defence, but only to be understood, for she has bravely acted out her nature, and always with good intentions.'

—Vol. iii. p. 115.

We need not pursue this disgraceful subject with her; but this it is to be one of the 'emancipated women.' Of course, Margaret had strong views on the rights of women. She was a great disdainer of the ordinary restrictions of society, and addresses her gentleman friends with a very masterly disregard of customary reserves. Perhaps we cannot wonder at Mr. Freeman Clarke for publishing fragments of letters from a young lady of three-and-twenty, so highly flattering to his

self-love. She addresses Mr. Emerson as 'My best one,' which, as Mrs. Emerson did not object to, neither do we; and is particular to allow no difference of expression to distinguish the sex of her correspondent. But underneath all these mannish airs poor Margaret hides a woman's heart. She realizes her own deficiencies for inspiring an exclusive affection. She feels her want of beauty. Writing in spring-time, she says, 'When all things are blossoming, it seems strange not to blossom too: man is the slowest aloe, and I am such a shabby plant, of such coarse tissue. I hate not to be beautiful, when all around is so,' (vol. ii. p. 83;) and again hints at the pains of a disposition that requires refined tenderness, 'without charms to inspire it.' She knew all the while that there was no risk or danger of these gentlemen changing into lovers. In the midst of innumerable friendships with all persons and degrees, countless confidences, and the most penetrating intimacies, she saw quite clearly that 'none loved her best,' and she felt it keenly. It finds no unmaidenly expression in her more private written thoughts, where we see her excited, restless intellect longing for rest, and quite weary of the overwork with which she taxes it. She considered the two trials of her life, obstructions to her genius, and loneliness of heart. 'No one loves me,' she says, 'but I love many a good deal.' She longed, as all must, to be cared for, not for her intellect, but for herself, and on this account she intensely valued the love of children, and brought out all her fascinations to amuse them, and make herself necessary to them. She had, moreover, at the bottom, some perception of the limitation of her own powers; and now and then we find her habitual arrogance pleasantly redeemed by some flowers of unlooked-for humility. For example, she knows herself bounded by a woman's powers:—

'Then a woman of tact and brilliancy, like me, has an undue advantage in conversation with men. They are astonished at our instincts. They do not see where we got our knowledge; and, while they tramp on in their clumsy way, we wheel, and fly, and dart hither and thither, and seize with ready eye all the weak points, like Saladin in the desert. It is quite another thing when we come to write, and, without suggestion from another mind, to declare the positive amount of thought that is in us.'—Vol. ii. p. 88.

'For all the tides of life within me, I am dumb and ineffectual, when it comes to casting my thoughts into a form.'—Vol. ii. p. 90.

On reading the '*Novum Organum*,' she says:—

'I have been examining myself with severity, intellectually as well as morally, and am shocked to find how vague and superficial is all my knowledge.'

Again:—

'For myself, I had wished to write a few pages now and then . . . but in truth I have not much to say; for since I have had leisure to look at

myself, I find that, so far from being an original genius, I have not yet learned to think to any depth, and that the utmost I have done in life has been to form my character to a certain consistency, cultivate my tastes, and learn to tell the truth with a little better grace than I did at first. For this the world will not care much.'—Vol. ii. p. 201.

She was sensitive, too, of all failure of gallant respect to women, as women; she could not bear what she called *sans culotte*, rude manners, and appreciated the ancient observances of courtesy which result from honour towards the weaker vessel. But along with these demands our friend was an advocate for woman's rights. After completing her pamphlet entitled, 'Women of the Nineteenth Century,' she felt 'a delightful glow' of satisfaction, as if she had put a good deal of her true life into 'it.' In this pamphlet she demands from man every privilege acquired by himself—elective franchise, tenure of property, and liberty to speak in public assemblies—and suggests to her countrywomen the propriety of making their first stand for equal rights on the 'Texas Annexation project:' on this subject she would like to convene meetings of women everywhere. The men of her party profess to support these views. Mr. Emerson commits himself to a wish for political rights to women, without stipulations. Mr. Greeley, the editor of the 'Tribune,' with whose family she was domesticated some time,—more cautious, seems disposed to a compromise with his countrywomen. He stipulates for a relaxation of those stringent, somewhat imperious laws of politeness by which Americans are at present bound, as the penalty of their new privileges. He pleads the hardship of having to give his arm to conduct that woman out of the ball-room, or into the dining-room, or for a walk of half-a-mile in the dark, (perhaps at much personal inconvenience,) who insists upon her right and fitness to be a member of congress or a sea captain. However, Margaret would not see this at all, and still insisted on the old prescriptive civilities, in spite of his frequent arguments on the subject; which we are glad to know, as it proves her political aspirations to be very unreal things.

Margaret's fame really rests upon her conversational powers—of all gifts the most difficult to *report* to others. People cannot remember the words even, and words are not all: the look, the tone, the emphasis, all make good talking what it is to us, and these are incommunicable. However, these volumes furnish us with quite a new test by which to estimate excellence in this department, and, as the world goes, not at all a bad one—people *paid* to hear Margaret talk. We have seen that she felt writing difficult, tedious, unsatisfactory; yet she wanted money, and must have it. The ingenious idea then occurred to her, to turn her conversational powers to account in this way,

and at the same time to cultivate those of others; and she proposed to the ladies of Boston to establish a conversation *class*, of which she was to be the head and leader. The ladies of Boston were not backward to embrace this new idea; they were, in fact, astonishingly well prepared, each and all, with a store of the most profound remarks, which could nowhere else have found such appropriate expression. Margaret seems to have felt that there were multitudes of questions on which women had to make up their minds, which her present scheme would furnish a scene for, which could scarcely find an answer or be worked out on the domestic hearth, where so many interruptions come in the way. As her circular expresses it:—

'Could a circle be assembled in earnest, desirous to answer the questions—What are we born to do? and how shall we do it?—which so few ever propose to themselves till their best years are gone by, I should think the undertaking a noble one; and if my resources should prove sufficient to make me its moving spring, I should be willing to give to it a large portion of those coming years, which will, as I hope, be my best. I look upon it with no blind enthusiasm, nor unlimited faith, but with a confidence that I have attained a distinct perception of means, which, if there are persons competent to direct them, can supply a great want, and promote really high objects.'—Vol. ii. pp. 130, 131.

But we must not go on quoting from a document which really places a questionable project in a plausible light; if we did not know that fine talking, always a dangerous amusement, would be much more dangerous set out with all this formality, and rendered such an engine of display and pretension. Margaret, however, talked from a better motive than mere display; and she had, besides, sufficiently appropriate scenes for her own display elsewhere. She had, indeed, talked to her heart's content in all the cities of the Union; and it was some credit that she would now bring out her full powers, such as they were, in a party of ladies only. She came to these meetings very well dressed, which is more than once noticed by those who report these meetings, (reminding us of the attention to this point in Tenneyson's female college,) and altogether 'looking sumptuously,' and certainly, from the following passage, showed herself equal to carrying out her idea.

'She began them with an exordium, in which she gave her leading views; and those exordiums were excellent, from the elevation of the tone, the ease and flow of discourse, and from the tact with which they kept aloof from any excess, and from the gracefulness with which they were brought down, at last, to a possible level for others to follow. She made a pause, and invited the others to come in. Of course, it was not easy for every one to venture her remark after an eloquent discourse, and in the presence of twenty superior women, who were all inspired. But whatever was said, Margaret knew how to seize the good meaning of it with hospitality, and to make the speaker feel glad, and not sorry, that she had spoken. She showed

herself thereby fit to preside at such meetings, and imparted to the susceptible a wonderful reliance on her genius.'—Vol. ii. pp. 146, 147.

The class, Mr. Emerson informs us, first assembled at Miss Peabody's rooms in West-street, on the 6th November, 1839. Twenty-five ladies were present, and the circle comprised some of the most agreeable and intelligent women of Boston. They plunged at once into the meaning of the Grecian mythology, and a very esoteric line indeed was taken. 'The first day's topic was, 'the genealogy of heaven and earth; then the Will, (Jupiter;) the Understanding, (Mercury;) the celestial inspiration of genius, perception and transmission of divine law, (Apollo;) the terrene inspiration, the impassioned abandonment of genius (Bacchus.)' Never surely was there such a glorification and transcendentalizing of Lempriere and Tooke!

Margaret writes to Mr. Emerson in great spirits about her class:—

'Mrs. — came out in a way that surprised me. She seems to have shaken off a wonderful number of films. She showed pure vision sweet sincerity, and much talent. Mrs. — keeps us in good order, and takes care that Christianity and morality are not forgotten. . . . I assure you, there is more Greek than Bostonian spoken at the meetings; and we may have pure honey of Hymettus to give you yet.'—Vol. ii. pp. 138, 139.

Many ladies write their impressions of these conversations, all with great delight, and with considerable talent, too, in giving the scene; and Margaret always satisfies. On one occasion, 'the earnestness and simplicity of the discussion, (on Beauty,) as well as the gifts and graces of the speakers, gave it the charm of a Platonic dialogue.' On another, 'Margaret unfolded her idea of Bacchus.' On another, the story of Cupid and Psyche was told with fitting beauty by Margaret, and many fine conjectural interpretations were suggested from all parts of the room.' Of a subsequent series a lady writes, 'I never heard, read of, or imagined conversation at all equal to this we have heard.' Another writes, 'It is sometimes said that women never are so lovely and enchanting in the company of their own sex merely, but it requires the other to draw them out. Certain it is that Margaret never appears when I see her either so brilliant or so deep in thought, or so desirous to please, or so modest, or so heart-touching, as in this very party.' But our readers may have a curiosity to judge for themselves what these conversations which charmed the hearers so much were like. The following discusses the actual question for which, it may be remembered, the meetings were first designed:—

'March 22, 1841.—The question of the day was, What is life?

'Let us define, each in turn, our idea of living. Margaret did not believe we had, any of us, a distinct idea of life.

'A. S. thought so great a question ought to be given for a written definition. "No," said Margaret, "that is of no use. When we go away to think of anything, we never do think. We all talk of life. We all have some thought now. Let us tell it. C——, what is life?"

'C—— replied,—“It is to laugh, or cry, according to our organization.”

'“Good,” said Margaret, “but not grave enough. Come, what is life? I know what I think; I want you to find out what you think.”

'Miss P. replied,—“Life is division from one's principle of life in order to a conscious reorganization. We are cut up by time and circumstance, in order to feel our reproduction of the eternal law.”

'Mrs. E.—“We live by the will of God, and the object of life is to submit,” and went on into Calvinism.

'Then came up all the antagonisms of Fate and Freedom.

'Mrs. H. said,—“God created us in order to have a perfect sympathy from us as free beings.”

'Mrs. A. B. said she thought the object of life was to attain absolute freedom. At this Margaret immediately and visibly kindled.

'C. S. said,—“God creates from the fulness of life, and cannot but create; He created us to overflow, without being exhausted, because what He created necessitated new creation. It is not to make us happy, but creation is His happiness and ours.”

'Margaret was then pressed to say what she considered life to be.

'Her answer was so full, clear, and concise, at once, that it cannot but be marred by being drawn through the scattering medium of my memory. But here are some fragments of her satisfying statement.

'She began with God as Spirit, Life so full as to create and love eternally, yet capable of pause. Love and creativeness are dynamic forces, out of which we, individually, as creatures, go forth bearing his image, that is, having within our being the same dynamic forces, by which we also add constantly to the total sum of existence, and shaking off ignorance and its effects, and by becoming more ourselves, *i.e.* more divine;—destroying sin in its principle, we attain to absolute freedom, we return to God, conscious like Himself, and as his friends, giving as well as receiving, felicity for evermore. In short, we become gods, and able to give the life which we now feel ourselves able only to receive.

'On Saturday morning, Mrs. L. E. and Mrs. E. H. were present, and begged Margaret to repeat the statement concerning life, with which she closed the last conversation. Margaret said she had forgotten every word she said. She must have been inspired by a good genius, to have so satisfied everybody,—but the good genius had left her. She would try, however, to say what she thought, and trusted it would resemble what she had said already. She then went into the matter, and, true enough, she did not use a single word she used before.”—Vol. ii. pp. 159—162.

After having faced, whether we have mastered or not, the awful depths of these remarks, the sterner sex will be in a fitting state of humility to receive a statement which candour obliges us to record, against the lords of the creation. The gentlemen, hearing the golden report of these meetings, begged that an evening class might be formed into which they might be admitted. It was agreed to—the subject was mythology. Mr. Emerson was present. He says:—

'Margaret spoke well,—she could not otherwise,—but I remember that she seemed encumbered, or interrupted, by the *headiness* or *incapacity* of the men, whom she had not had the advantage of training, and who fancied,

no doubt, that on such a question, they, too, must assert and dogmatize.'—Vol. ii. p. 162.

We must not, however, linger in the schools of this Athens of the West, but with no other connectives than are implied in the last words of our extract transport our readers to Europe, where Margaret at length finds herself, having repaired thither in the hope of restoring her health and exhausted energies. She had settled her family comfortably, and now felt herself at liberty to indulge her cherished longing; and gladly joining some friends who had planned the tour of our continent, sailed with them from New York, August 1846. There she plunges at once into congenial Scotch and English society—describes Wordsworth and De Quincy, gets benighted and nearly lost on Ben Lomond—of which adventure she writes home a very good description—comes to London, and is introduced to her teacher and hero Carlyle, whose 'trumpet blasts' had long ago aroused and awakened her. We leave the question to her biographers to settle how far it is right to publish her impressions of his conversation. We have only to do with the description itself, and those who have so recently read Mr. Carlyle's recollections of Coleridge's inspired discourse—his *sum-jective* and *om-jective*, too truthfully and pitilessly chronicled—his endless not-to-be-interrupted flow so ably satired—will be amused at the poetical justice of the following picture. Possibly the high tone of praise in the opening may be considered as atoning for what follows, but we doubt its really doing so; for what must be the quality or value of that eloquence which wearies the listener?

'Of the people I saw in London you will wish me to speak first of the Carlyles. Mr. C. came to see me at once, and appointed an evening to be passed at their house. That first time I was delighted with him. He was in a very sweet humour—full of wit and pathos, without being overbearing or oppressive. I was quite carried away with the rich flow of his discourse; and the hearty noble earnestness of his personal being, brought back the charm which once was upon his writing before I wearied of it. I admired his Scotch, his way of singing his great full sentences, so that each one was like the stanza of a narrative ballad. He let me talk now and then, enough to free my lungs and change my position, so that I did not get tired. . . . I left him that night, intending to go out very often to their house. I assure you there never was anything so witty as Carlyle's description of —. It was enough to kill one with laughing. I on my side contributed a story to his fund of anecdote on this subject, and it was fully appreciated. Carlyle is worth a thousand of you for that; he is not ashamed to laugh when he is amused, but goes on in a cordial human fashion. The second time Mr. C. had a dinner party. . . . — was allowed to interrupt him a little, of which one was glad, for that night he was in his more acrid mood; and though much more brilliant than on the former evening, grew wearisome to me, who disclaimed and rejected almost everything he said.

'For a couple of hours he was talking about poetry, and the whole harangue was one eloquent proclamation of the defects in his own mind. Tennyson wrote in verse because the schoolmasters had taught him that it

was great to do so, and had thus unfortunately been turned from the true path for a man. Burns had in like manner been turned from his vocation. Shakspeare had not had the good sense to see that it would have been better to write straight on in prose;—and such nonsense, which, though amusing enough at first, he ran to death after a while. The most amusing part is always when he comes back to some refrain, as in the French Revolution of the *Sea Green*. In this instance it was Petrarch and *Laura*—the last word pronounced with his ineffable sarcasm of drawl. Although he said this over fifty times, I could not ever help laughing when *Laura* would come; Carlyle running his chin out, when he spoke it, and his eyes glancing till they looked like the eyes and beak of a bird of prey. Poor *Laura*! Lucky for her that her poet had already got her safely canonized beyond the reach of this Teuflesdröckh vulture.

‘The worst of hearing Carlyle is, that you cannot interrupt him. I understand the habit and power of haranguing have increased very much upon him, so that you are a perfect prisoner when he has once got hold of you. To interrupt him is a physical impossibility. If you get a chance to remonstrate for a moment, he raises his voice and bears you down. True, he does you no injustice, and, with his admirable penetration, sees the disclaimer in your mind; so that you are not morally delinquent; but it is not pleasant to be unable to utter it.’—Vol. iii. pp. 96—99.

The conclusion of this remarkable woman’s history is so strange, romantic, and tragical, so removed in scene and circumstance from the tenor of her previous life, that but for some connecting links of tone and phraseology, it would often be hard to realize the identity of the American *esprit fort* and the Italian heroine. Europe was the country of her youth’s romance, and to her it certainly proved so. Her travels brought her to Rome in the spring of 1847, having previously in London formed a friendship with Mazzini. At once she plunged into the stormy politics of that time and place; so that from that period her letters to America are full of the feverish triumphs of the Revolution, the Pope’s early popularity, and the subsequent failure of the Republican cause, and the acute bitter disappointment of all concerned, of which she at least bore her share. She shows a fitting feminine abhorrence of fighting and bloodshed, and the other horrors inseparable from war, when it affects her own party (though she manifests little enough remorse at Rossi’s murder); and was so far naturalized and identified with the cause as to be placed, by a formal commission, in charge of a hospital for the wounded. There she made good practical use of her energy and talents, devoted herself with ardour to her harassing and painful duties, and won the enthusiastic love and reverence of the unhappy men under her care.

All this, however, we have not space for. The three years in and near Rome are distinguished by another event of a more personal nature. No other than her marriage, which she strangely chose to keep secret till it became absolutely necessary to disclose it. Some reasons are assigned for this secrecy

—as the peril to her husband's small patrimony had his Protestant marriage been prematurely disclosed; but she hardly affects to call this the real reason of her reserve to her own family. Margaret's views were so little in accordance with our Christian ideas on such subjects, that it is well to explain that there seems no reason to apprehend any discreditable cause for mystery. The lady of the American consul writes conclusively on this head. So for want of other reason we must suspect that Margaret was a little ashamed of herself in the matter, and really did not know how to tell her mother, and give such a turn to her history as should sustain her own intellectual dignity and supremacy. Madame de Staël, in her *Corinne*, compliments the men of Italy as being of all nations most tolerant of genius in women. And Mr. Emerson on one occasion speaks vaguely of the homage that was paid to Margaret there, and 'the offers of marriage made to her by distinguished parties;' but we must take leave to doubt this assertion in its literal sense. Admiration is one thing, many real proposals of marriage to such a woman as Margaret Fuller another. She does, indeed, speak in one letter of knowing in Milan 'some Radicals, young, and interested in ideas,' which of course were of her suggesting; but the peculiarity of her choice at last was, that he was *not* interested in ideas.

It is a very remarkable fact to those curious in such histories, that on the first—and as it seems in his case—decisive meeting between this plain eloquent woman and her future husband, (many years her junior,) she was as yet so little conversant with his language that they could hardly talk at all. The interest of the meeting was of quite another kind than the communication of ideas. Simply she lost her party in S. Peter's. He saw a foreign lady uneasy, possibly a little alarmed at finding herself alone, and evening coming on; and as any gentleman would, he offered his services first to get her carriage, and, none being to be found, to escort her home on foot, talking, as we have said, but little by the way. It was lucky for this little romance that her views of the proper place and position of woman had not taken so practical a turn as to make her, as they should in reason have done, superior to this confession of weakness and need of protection. The acquaintance thus begun was eagerly cultivated by the young Marquis Ossoli, who within a very short time made her the offer of his hand, which she at first refused. However, after a short independent tour to the chief Italian towns, she returned to Rome. Her influence induced him to take a decided part against the politics of his family in the liberal contest, and in December 1847 they were privately married. All her anxieties about public events were indefi-

nately increased by the discomforts and sometimes actual miseries her secret involved, besides the perpetual trial of want of money. In the September of the following year her son was born, and her husband's military duties, which he seems to have performed with great spirit and courage, and the necessity of leaving her child in the country, separated her from each except for occasional stolen interviews. She was truly devoted to both. She seems for the time to have enjoyed her husband's companionship the more because he was uncongenial to her intellectual nature, and did not value her for it. She compares his affection for her to the love of children, which she had always so highly valued. When she at length finds it necessary to write to her mother on the subject, she thus describes him. A very agreeable portrait it is; only,—could we change the personal pronouns—it would sound more naturally as a clever man's description of his *wife* :—

‘He is not in any respect such a person as people in general would expect to find with me. He had no instructor except an old priest, who entirely neglected his education; and of all that is contained in books he is absolutely ignorant; and he has no enthusiasm of character. On the other hand, he has excellent practical sense; has been a judicious observer of all that passed before his eyes; has a nice sense of duty, which, in its unflinching, minute activity may put most enthusiasts to shame; a very sweet temper, and great native refinement. His love for me has been unswerving and most tender. I have never suffered a pain that he could relieve. His devotion when I am ill is to be compared only with yours. His delicacy in trifles, his sweet domestic graces, remind me of E—. In him I have found a home, and one that interferes with no tie. Amid many ills and cares we have had much joy together, in the sympathy with natural beauty,—with our child,—with all that is innocent and sweet. I do not know whether he will always love me so well, for I am the elder, and the difference will become in a few years more perceptible than now. But life is so uncertain, and it is so necessary to take good things with their limitations, that I have not thought it worth while to calculate too curiously. . .

* * * * *

‘What shall I say of my child? All might seem hyperbole even to my dearest mother. In him I find satisfaction for the first time to the deep wants of my heart. . . . He is a fair child, with blue eyes, and light hair; very affectionate, graceful, and sportive. He was baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, by the name of Angelo Eugene Philip, for his father, grandfather, and my brother. He inherits the title of Marquis. Write the name of my child in your Bible, ANGELO OSSOLI, born September 5, 1848. God grant he may live to see you, and may prove worthy of your love!’—
Vol. iii. pp. 225—227.

Ossoli, though in common with the liberal party he hated priests, is described as a devout Roman Catholic. He used to attend regularly the vespers service, (says one who has given an interesting sketch of their life at Florence before embarking on their fatal voyage,) in some of the older and quieter churches, and his wife frequently accompanied him on these occasions. The same writer, in relating some anecdotes

of Margaret's courage and her influence over the Italian peasantry, says,—

‘Her husband related to me once, with a most reverent enthusiasm, some stories of the good she had done in Rieti during her residence there. . . . Such incidents . . . seemed to have inspired him with a feeling of respect for her amounting to reverence. This feeling, modifying the manifest tenderness with which he hung upon her every word and look, and sought to anticipate her simplest wishes, was luminously visible in the air and manner of his affectionate devotion to her. . . . He seemed quite absorbed in his wife and child. I cannot remember ever to have found Madame Ossoli alone on those evenings when she remained at home. Her husband was always with her. The picture of their room rises clearly before me . . . there, seated beside his wife, I was sure to find the Marthuse reading from some patriotic book, and dressed in the dark brown undecorated coat of the Guardia Civica, which it was his melancholy pleasure to wear at home. So long as the conversation could be carried on in Italian, he used to remain, though he rarely joined in it to any considerable degree; but if a number of English and American visitors came in, he used to take his leave, and go to the Café d'Italia, being very unwilling, as Madame Ossoli told me, to impose any seeming restraint, by his presence, upon her friends, with whom he was unable to converse.’—Vol. II. pp. 298—301.

The tragedy which so soon followed gives a melancholy interest to details which we must not further enlarge upon. How long this attachment between beings so dissimilar could have lasted may be doubted, yet for ourselves we have faith in Margaret so far that we believe this new relation, this life of the affections, might have led to further good. But the test of time was not to be granted. Various reasons determined Margaret to return to America, though with some regret at taking her husband to so uncongenial a sphere. However, it was in their plans to come back to Italy in a few years, perhaps to settle there. Margaret, always superstitious, had many nervous fears about the voyage, and Ossoli too, who had had previous experience of omens, recalled an early gipsy warning to beware of the sea. Not yielding to these dim fears, however, they took berths in the *Elizabeth* merchant vessel, sailing from Leghorn, as the expenses of the voyage by this means would be much lessened, and there were just grounds of confidence in the vessel and the captain. So Margaret embarked with all her treasures, her husband, her child, and next to these her manuscripts, her history of the Italian struggle for liberty, which the liberal party looked forward to as so true and full a record of their ineffectual labours. The first disaster of the voyage was the death of the captain from small-pox, which the poor little Angelino took from him, but through the careful nursing and sensible treatment of the parents soon recovered from. After this, from Gibraltar to within sight of the American shores, the winds and waves were propitious. On Thursday, July 16th,

the officer in command promised his passengers that the next day he would land them at New York. Joyful preparations were made by all on board, 'and with grateful hearts Margaret and Ossoli put Nino to rest, for the last time, as they thought, 'on ship board—for the last time, it was to be, on earth.' A hurricane arose in the night, but still no one had any fear, for the only cause for alarm, the dangerous Jersey coast, was believed to be far distant. All had retired to rest, when, at four o'clock of Friday morning the vessel ran aground on the Sand Bars of Long Island:—

'At the first jar, the passengers, knowing but too well its fatal import, sprang from their berths. Then came the cry of "Cut away," followed by the crash of falling timbers, and the thunder of the seas, as they broke across the deck. In a moment more, the cabin skylight was dashed in pieces by the breakers, and the spray, pouring down like a cataract, put out the lights, while the cabin door was wrenched from its fastenings, and the waves swept in and out. One scream, one only, was heard from Margaret's state-room. . . . It was in the grey dusk, and amid the awful tumult, that the companions in misfortune met. The side of the cabin to the leeward had already settled under water; and furniture, trunks, and fragments of the skylight were floating to and fro; while the inclined position of the floor made it difficult to stand; and every sea, as it broke over the bulwarks, splashed in through the open roof. The windward cabin-walls, however, still yielded partial shelter, and against it, seated side by side, half leaning backwards, with feet braced upon the long table, they awaited what next should come. At first, Nino, alarmed at the uproar, the darkness, and the rushing water, while shivering with the wet, cried passionately; but soon his mother, wrapping him in such garments as were at hand, and folding him to her bosom, sang him to sleep. Celeste too was in an agony of terror, till Ossoli, with soothing words and a long and fervent prayer, restored her to self-control and trust. Then calmly they rested side by side. . . . Thus passed three hours.'—Vol. iii. pp. 323, 324.

About seven in the morning there were symptoms of the cabin breaking up, and, with the greatest hazard and danger, they made their way on deck to the fore-castle, which was comparatively dry and sheltered, where the party again seated themselves, and, wrapped in the overcoats of the seamen, regained some warmth. The mate made his way then to the cabin, to save money and other valuables for the passengers. 'There still remains,' Margaret said, 'what, if I live, will be of more value to me than anything.' She meant her manuscripts; but it seemed too selfish to ask the brave sailor to run further risk. In the meanwhile they were within sight of shore; but the witnesses of the wreck were too busy gathering into carts whatever spoil was stranded, to make any efforts for the wretched people on deck; and even when a lifeboat was procured, none ventured to man her. It was seen from the wreck, only to add to the anguish of these mortal hours of agony. A desperate attempt was now proposed to save the passengers by means of

planks, placing each upon a plank and grasping handles of rope, while a sailor swam behind; and the widow of the captain was actually saved by this means. When Margaret's turn came, she resolutely refused to leave her husband and child. She was willing to adventure with them on a raft; but without them she would not go. Possibly, she did not know the success that had accompanied one attempt; possibly, she still depended on the life-boat; on whatever ground, she resisted all persuasions—she entertained a hope that they might yet be saved—saved all together.

'Alas! to the experienced eyes of the sailors it too soon became evident that there was no attempt to launch or man her. The last chance of aid from shore then was gone utterly. They must rely on their own strength, or perish. And if ever they were to escape, the time had come; for at noon the storm had somewhat lulled; but already the tide had turned, and it was plain that the wreck could not hold together through another flood. In this emergency, the commanding officer, who until now had remained at his post, once more appealed to Margaret to try to escape—urging that the ship would inevitably break up soon; that it was mere suicide to remain longer; that he did not feel free to sacrifice the lives of the crew, or to throw away his own; finally, that he would himself take Angelo, and that sailors should go with Celeste (the nurse), Ossoli, and herself. But, as before, Margaret decisively declared that she would not be parted from her husband or her child. The order was then given to "save themselves;" and all but four of the crew jumped over, several of whom, together with the commander, reached shore alive, though severely bruised and wounded by the drifting fragments.'—Vol. iii. pp. 329, 330.

It is remarkable, certainly, and we have therefore given these details, to see this strong-minded woman ruled by a blind instinct of affection, at such a moment, rather than by the sense and reason which had been her life-long boast, and which would unquestionably have led her to follow the directions of those who understood their situation so much better than she could do. But her habit of self-dependence seems to have prevailed over her judgment in this crisis. Little doubt seems to be entertained that some, at least, might have been spared had she yielded to the advice so urgently pressed upon her, as those were who obeyed the captain's orders. But we must remain for a few moments longer on the wreck, with those whom her influence still detained upon it:—

'It was now past three o'clock, and as, with the rising tide, the gale swelled once more to its former violence, the remnants of the barque fast yielded to the resistless waves. . . . It was plain to all that the final moment drew swiftly nigh. Of the four seamen who still stood by the passengers three were as efficient as any among the crew of the *Elizabeth*. These were the steward, carpenter, and cook. . . . These men were once again persuading Margaret Ossoli and Celeste to try the planks, which they held ready in the lee of the ship; and the steward, by whom Nino was so much beloved, had just taken the little fellow in his arms, with the pledge that

he would save him or die, when a sea struck the fore-castle, and the fore-mast fell, carrying with it the deck and all upon it. The steward and Angelino were washed upon the beach, both dead, though warm, some twenty minutes after. The cook and carpenter were thrown far upon the foremast, and saved themselves by swimming. Celeste and Ossoli caught for a moment by the rigging, but the next wave swallowed them up. Margaret sank at once. When last seen she had been seated at the foot of the foremast, still clad in her white night-dress, with her hair fallen loose upon her shoulders. It was over—that twelve hours' communion face to face with death! it was over! and the prayer was granted, "that Ossoli, Angelo, and I, may go together, and that the anguish may be brief." . . . "It is a touching coincidence," writes a friend of Margaret's, who hastened to the coast on hearing of the wreck, "that the only one of Margaret's treasures which reached the shore, was the lifeless form of Angelino. When the body, stripped of every rag by the waves, was rescued from the surf, a sailor took it reverently in his arms, and wrapping it in his neckcloth, bore it to the nearest house. There, when washed, and dressed in a child's frock found in Margaret's trunk, it was laid upon a bed; and as the rescued seamen gathered round their late playfellow and pet, there were few dry eyes in the circle. . . . Next day, borne upon their shoulders, in a chest which one of the sailors gave for a coffin, it was buried in a hollow among the sand-heaps. . . . To-morrow, Margaret's mother, sister, and brothers will remove Nino's body to New England."—Vol. iii. pp. 330—335.

No trace was found of the precious manuscripts,—of all the writings on which she had been so busy, and which she brought to her own country for publication; nothing but Margaret's and Ossoli's love letters remain.

We need add no comments of ours to this sad and affecting story, throwing so strange a pathos as it does over a character calculated to excite a very different class of feelings. Many thoughts are suggested by it; thoughts of that special Providence in which she did not believe, and to which, as it seems, she did not appeal in her extremity, as far at least as we may gather from the absence of all mention of such an appeal; thoughts of pity, too, and admiration for the love and constancy which death could not shake: and of hope, if the term is not too positive, that changes there may have been in the innermost soul as great as were wrought by the few last years in her external nature, of which—by the tokens of manner and deportment—her friends could judge, give witness. Hers is an instructive history, though the tone of her biographers may make it also a dangerous one to all who cannot discriminate between the points of her actual character and the circumstances of her life, and their comments upon them.

ART. V.—ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΙΚΕΤΙΔΕΣ. *Æschyli Supplices. Recensuit F. A. PALEY. Editio Emendatio.* Cambridge: Deighton. 1851.

THE appearance of a second edition of Mr. Paley's *Supplices of Æschylus* within seven years, may, we hope, be taken as a sign that classical studies are not so much neglected in England as their best friends are sometimes tempted to suppose. The experiment was rather a crucial one. The play with which Mr. Paley commenced his labours on Æschylus had the advantage or disadvantage of being the one of the whole seven on which the least attention had been bestowed. We do not know how it is at Cambridge, but at Oxford, to the present day, candidates even for the highest honours, while including Æschylus in their list of books for examination, are accustomed to make a special exception in disfavour of the *Supplices*. With books, as with dogs, it would seem, to get a bad name is as fatal as hanging. The play is by no means the most difficult, or, considered as a whole, the most corrupt of the remains of the great poet; but it happens to contain one passage of tolerable length which has been more tampered with than any in the Greek drama, and on the strength of this a *cordon sanitaire* has been drawn round the whole. The act of injustice thus done is great, and the loss considerable. If not the oldest extant specimen of Æschylus, and consequently of Grecian tragedy, it is, at any rate, as Professor Blackie remarks, the one which, by the simplicity of its structure, is best adapted to give us a notion of the Athenian stage in its earlier days, when the lyrical element was still prevalent over the dramatic. Nor is the interest which it creates merely historical. The Chorus supports the main burden of the play, and it is equal to the weight. We are not, indeed, thrilled by the spirit of unconscious prophecy, as in the odes of the Agamemnon, nor awed by the actual voice of divine vengeance embodied, as in those of the Eumenides; but we are everywhere made conscious of a mingled tone of tenderness and austerity, of timidity and heroism, of grateful emotion and self-possessed dignity, of fervent entreaty and calm resignation, which reminds us not only that the songs are those of suppliant maidens, but that the minstrel is Æschylus.

It must not be dissembled, that the neglect of which we complain is in some measure owing to the critics. Up to the beginning of the present century, so far as we know, as fair a

chance had been given to the Supplices as to any of the sister dramas. In those days, the holiday task-work of editing a single play had not become common—at least, in the case of an author like Æschylus, less voluminous even than the writer whose ‘historical works’ startled Mr. Cobden the other day so unaccountably by their unknown bulk. What Stanley, Pauw, and Schutz did for the other six plays, that they did for the Supplices—not that we mean to class the three together, to lower the German to the level of the Dutchman, or to raise him to that of the Englishman. When the Glasgow edition was enriched by the sweepings of Porson’s study, the portion of the inheritance which fell to the Supplices was not the least extensive: nor were they forgotten in Butler’s cumbrous Variorum. But since that time, the favours of fortune have been partial. Blomfield’s Æschylus, as is well known, embraces only five plays out of the seven; and the Supplices was, unfortunately, one of those which the pall of episcopal investiture consigned to their funeral. Mr. Burges, indeed, some years before, had singled them out for the honour of his special notice; but his devotion too much resembles that of the savages, who assume the right of chastising and torturing the objects of their adoration. Scholefield is meagreness itself: generally judicious, as a man will always appear who seldom commits himself, but with little positive merit. His book, however, was fortunate enough to draw forth a masterly article by J. Wordsworth in the ‘Philological Museum,’ and in this the Supplices occupy a considerable place; but the remarks, though extremely valuable, are fragmentary and scattered, and cannot be said to amount to a regular commentary. In Germany, things have not been much better. Klausen, who has entered into the poet’s meaning more thoroughly than any editor of the present—perhaps, of any generation—did not live to advance beyond the Agamemnon and the Choephoræ. Hermann, the Coryphæus of a rival school of criticism, though reputed to be engaged on Æschylus all his life, published scarcely anything of importance, except on the Eumenides. Of those who have brought out complete editions of the seven plays, Wellauer is discreet, and at times highly ingenious, but far too dogmatic in his adherence to the text of the MSS., especially as while repudiating correction, he rarely attempts explanation. Bothe, rash and inconsiderate to the last degree in his youth, has been tamed down by advancing years not so much into wisdom as into dulness. Haupt, so far as we are aware, is the only one who has treated the Supplices separately; and his notes are more remarkable for useless facts and unfruitful speculations than for any real light which they throw either on the language, or on the sense.

Such was the state of criticism when Mr. Paley’s first edition

appeared. No candid judge, we conceive, can deny that it did much for the play, both critically and exegetically. Mr. Linwood, indeed, in a paper in the 'Classical Museum,' attempted something like a wholesale disparagement of its critical merits; but the force of his strictures was neutralized at the outset by a naïve confession, that but for having been thus anticipated in the publishing market, he had meant to edit the drama himself. The faults which he exposed might have been traced mainly to one cause—an imperfect acquaintance with the writings of others. For a defect like this, the best apology is amendment: and of such an amendment the book before us is the best evidence. Warned by experience, Mr. Paley has now read and written up to his time: the result is seen not only in his adoption of the corrections or explanations of preceding critics, but also in those cases where he still sees right to trust to his own judgment. If in the course of the following remarks we have detected a few remaining oversights, they may serve to remind us of the truth of the maxim, *εἰς ἀνὴρ οὐ πάνθ' ὄρα*. But they can no longer, even in the mind of the most prejudiced, interfere with a recognition of Mr. Paley's just claims to the honours of successful labour in a comparatively untried field.

We proceed to examine Mr. Paley's notes in detail, after the usual caution to our readers against supposing that the proportion of our points of agreement with him to our points of difference is to be measured by the space which they occupy respectively in our critique. Those who follow him as we have done, and those only, will be in a position to do justice to his distinctive merits—his critical sagacity, occasionally rising to real intuitive felicity, his appreciation of the conditions of language, removed alike from transcendental refinement and narrow bigotry to usage, the good taste which enables him, as a general rule, to perceive the natural requirements of a passage, and the variety of his reading, which frequently supplies the very illustration wanted to clear up a difficulty.

V. 3. Mr. Paley gives up Abresch's conjecture, ἀποπρὸ στομίων, which he had adopted in his first edition, and returns to the old reading, ἀπὸ προστομίων. We do not feel sure that his retractation is a wise one. Στόμιον is unquestionably a good word: προστόμιον less clearly so, not being sufficiently supported by προστομία, προστομὶς, πρόστομος, in all of which πρὸ appears to have a peculiar force, hardly discernible here. Ἀποπρὸ, on the other hand, is abundantly justified by examples, and well explained by Mr. Paley himself, αἰρεῖν ἀποπρὸ γῆς, 'ita solvere ut procul a terrâ feraris, ut Danaus ex Ægypto ad Argos relatus.' The 'librorum auctoritas,' in the matter of a division of words, is next to nothing; and the Aldine ἀπὸ στομίων may be set against

the fact, that the Scholiast undoubtedly did read *προστομίον*. In preferring *λεπτοψαμάθων*, Pauw's correction of *λεπτομαθῶν*, to Stanley's *τῶν λεπτοβαθῶν* (the latter word after Vettori), we cordially agree with Mr. Paley.

V. 8. Here again Mr. Paley recalls the common text, *τὸν φυξάνορα*, for which he had substituted Hermann's *φυξανορία*. The position of the article, so far from being an objection, is rather an argument in favour of the old reading, showing that *αὐτογενῇ ἀσεβῇ τε* are to be construed as what Donaldson (New Cratylus, § 301) calls a tertiary predicate. So, v. 27, *δέξαισθ' ἱκέτην τὸν θηλυγενῇ στόλον*. Mr. Paley, preferring to regard it generally as a case of 'articulus insolenter interpositus,' illustrates it by two instances not really in point, below, v. 190, and Theb. 315, in both of which the insertion of *καὶ* between the various epithets of the same word seems to us fatal to the supposed parallel. More serious objections to *τὸν φυξάνορα* are the MS. variations between *τὸν φυλαξάνοραν* and *φυξάνοραν*, and the metrical rule against the concurrence of four short syllables in an anapæstic system, a licence which, though occasionally indulged in by Euripides, seems not to have been elsewhere taken by Æschylus. *φυξάνωρ* itself, as an epithet of *γάμος*, has strong probability, and may be compared with *ἀστεργάνορα παρθενίαν*, in Prom. 898.

In v. 19, Mr. Paley seems right in adopting Haupt's correction *νῦν* for *οὔν*, as he assuredly is in reading, after Robortello, *ὦ πόλις, ὦ γῆ*, v. 23. Not to dwell on the harshness of the repetition of the relative in the common text, *ὦν—ὦν*, nor on the difficulty of supplying an antecedent, the structure of the whole sentence shows that *πόλις* and *γῆ* must be vocatives, as the invocation is clearly intended to run in the second person (cf. *πέμψατε*, v. 33), and the language will not allow us to separate *ὑπατοὶ τε θεοὶ κ.τ.λ.* from the rest of the sentence. *Τρίτος*, being a constant epithet of Zeus in his character of *Σωτήρ*, seems to be used less strictly than it would have been had it merely signified *third in order*—a sense, however, which it may be made to bear without doing violence to the passage, as Mr. Paley has shown. In v. 27, we need hardly say, *δέξαισθ'* has been rightly changed into *δέξαισθ'* or *δέξασθ'*.

V. 41. We are glad to see that Mr. Paley is disposed to modify the rigour of his original sentence, 'Verba τιμάωρ' ἰνὶν τ' procul dubio corrupta sunt.' He now pronounces them 'suspecta;' but even to this we must demur. Why should not *τιμάωρ* and *τιμάωρος* be equally legitimate, like *χρυσάωρ* and *χρυσάωρος*? Nor is there anything unusual in the epexegetical *τε*, another instance of which occurs almost immediately, v. 60, as Mr. Paley has himself remarked. The punctuation of v. 47, connecting

ἐφαψιν with what follows, not with what goes before, has long since been anticipated by Schutz.

V. 49. Mr. Paley rejects the Scholiast's interpretation of ἐπιλεξαμένα by ἐπικαλουμένη, though supported by Hesychius, as destitute of authority, remarking, that even if the verb could be used in this sense, the sentence would rather require the present participle. We think, however, that ἐπικεκλομένα above, v. 40, is nearly decisive of the meaning of ἐπιλεξαμένα here, as it certainly is of the admissibility of the aorist on the assumption that this meaning is the true one.

V. 52. Here we cannot doubt that Mr. Paley has done right in at last receiving Porson's emendation ἄτ' ἀνόμεν' οἶμαι, in the place of that by which he had formerly proposed himself to supersede the corrupt reading of the MSS. Τε in τά τε νῦν, which he seems to consider an objection, is clearly like παιών τε γενού, in Agam. 99, ἀρχάς τε . . . ἔξει, Choeph. 86, the contrast between τῶν πρόσθε and τὰ νῦν tending to bring out its force with peculiar distinctness.

V. 58. Mr. Paley, in his first edition, retained the MSS. reading ἀκούων, avoiding the charge of tautology by rendering αἶων 'understanding,' not 'hearing,' and construing, after Wellauer, ὅπα with δοξάσει, as in Choeph. 829, πῶς ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ . . . δοξάσω; In the interpretation of αἶων, to which he still adheres, he is probably right: in the construction of δοξάσει, which he now silently rejects, he seems to have been in error, as, admitting that δοξάζω may = νομίζω, we have yet to prove that δοξάσει ὅπα can stand for δοξάσει αὐτὸν ὅπα εἶναι. Nevertheless, ἀκούων, as it appears to us, might yet be defended, many other words of similar signification to δοξάζω being constructed with a participle as well as with an infinitive (such as αἰσθάνομαι, οἶδα, μανθάνω, &c.), if it were worth while to contend against the probability of so slight a corruption as that of εἰν into ων. In the preceding verse, Mr. Paley's second thoughts are certainly best, having led him to adopt Bamberger's suggestion, which by the omission of οἰκτρὸν and the resolution of the diphthong in ἔγγαιος, makes the metre correspond with that of the antistrophe. We wish, however, that he had been able to throw any additional light on the words which immediately follow, Τηρεῖας μήτιδος οἰκτρᾶς ἀλόχου, where the old interpretation, making Τηρεῖας μήτιδος equivalent to Τηρέως, and the new one, construing μήτιδος οἰκτρᾶς, *miserandæ propter consilium*, strike us as equally bad. Ματέρως for μήτιδος had occurred to us as a plausible conjecture before we knew it to have been anticipated by Bothe in his earlier and more innovating days; but it is an obvious objection that it would require to be separated from Τηρεῖας, with which its position would naturally connect it.

V. 66. Like Mr. Paley, we see no sufficient reason for altering
NO. LXXVI.—N.S. H H

Ἰαονίοισι, which, as he remarks, contrasts well with Νειλοθερῇ in the next line. The descent of the Danaïdes from Io gives a further propriety to the word (cf. Prom. 840), though there is neither authority nor reason for interpreting it 'querelis ad Iūs labores accommodatis.' The peculiarity of the national Ionian measure is also evidently alluded to.

V. 74. This line appears to us palpably corrupt. Ἦ καὶ is deficient in authority, (the oldest reading being ἦ βαί,) and does not help the sense: nor is it easy to believe with Mr. Paley that τέλειον ἔχειν means *votorum compotes fieri*. Schutz's ἦβαν by a very slight change restores tolerable sense, though there remains some harshness in the expression ἦβαν ἔχειν, 'to enjoy the prime of another.' In this respect, perhaps, ἡμαρ might be a better word, τέλειον ἡμαρ being used for the marriage, like Homer's δούλιον, ἐλεύθερον, νόστιμον ἡμαρ. M and β are occasionally confused, as above, (v. 15,) where for κύμ' ἄλιον, Robortello's MS. gives κυβαλέων, and in other instances referred to by Mr. Paley on v. 3. The sense of τέλειον was long since noticed by Stanley, but has not been attended to by later editors.

V. 77. Mr. Paley's ἔστιν δὲ πτολέμῳ, for ἔστι δὲ καὶ πτολέμῳ, is ingenious and probable: 'cur enim πτ.?'

Vv. 90—95. Wellauer has done much to restore this passage: ἦμενον ἄνω, however, still remains to disturb the metre. Mr. Paley reads ἦμενος ὄν, the latter word a conjecture of Haupt's: νήμενον ὄν might also be proposed, or σεμνὸν ἄνω. But we should greatly prefer to read ἢ μέμονεν, both as accounting better for the existing text and as more probable intrinsically. Lachmann, we have since found, suggested ἦν μεμόνη, which may reasonably be allowed to confirm our emendation, at the same time that it nearly anticipates it.

V. 101. We rather wonder that none of the editors should have thought of separating διάνοιαν into δι' ἄνοιαν. The language would be improved by the change, ἄνοια being the better word of the two, from its frequent application to acts of irregular passion (noticed by Mr. Paley elsewhere), and the construction with the preposition less involved than without it. Curiously enough, the scholiast uses the very word ἄνοια to explain δυσπαραβούλοισι φρεσίν: but the rest of his gloss shows him to have read διάνοιαν, unless we can suppose that two independent interpretations have come to be accidentally confused.

V. 108. Mr. Paley has done wisely to retract his condemnation of the MSS. reading, ζῶσα γόοις με τιμῶ. The appropriateness of the sentiment no one has denied: indeed, many passages have been adduced in imitation of it: τιμῶ is shown by parallel instances to be a very fitting word: and με for ἐμαντήν, the only difficulty which remains, might have been supported by Cho.

1060. ἐλεύθερόν σε τῶνδε πημάτων κτίσει. — Cf. Jelf, § 652, obs. 5.

V. 109. For ἰλέομαι Burges would read ἰλάομαι, which is more probable, not only as being itself the less doubtful form of the two, but as better suited to the dialect of the Chorus. So ἰλαος is used instead of the Attic ἰλέως in the choral parts of tragedy. In the next line the reading of the Med. seems clearly to point to Boissonade's conjecture, εὔ, γὰ, κοινεῖς. The sense, too, requires a vocative, to show who is addressed: and ἰὼ γὰ βοῦνι, v. 756, makes strongly for γὰ here. Donaldson, in the new edition of his *Cratylus*, p. 659, pronounces the passage 'almost hopelessly corrupt,' and proceeds to rewrite it: but he fails to satisfy us either of the existence of corruption, or of the probability of his restoration. When he says that he 'cannot believe that the 'second person of a verb would be inserted in the adversative 'clause to ἰλέομαι μὲν, and before ἐμπιτνῶ, which is the legitimate 'antithesis,' we are at a loss to see his meaning. If the objection is to the second person of a verb used in the adversative clause to one in which the first person is used, we can only refer him, among numberless other instances, to Cho. 848, ἠκούσαμεν μὲν, πυνθάνου δὲ τῶν ξένων. He may reply that this instance is not parallel, as the clause there is really, not apparently adversative. This brings us to the real question as regards the present passage. Δὲ in the clause καρβᾶνα δ' αὐδὰν is not, as it seems to us, adversative to μὲν, but copulative, the adversative δὲ coming just where he wishes it to come, before ἐμπιτνῶ. Similar instances are by no means uncommon: e.g. Eum. 95—100, where μὲν in ὦν μὲν ἔκτανον answers neither to αἰσχρῶς δ' nor to προυννέπω δ', but to παθοῦσα δ'. But what has this to do with the change of persons, unless indeed he would plead it as an objection that there happens to be no verb in the second person in the lines just referred to? πολλάκι he complains of as feeble in a sentence expressing the visible act of the suppliants: but the weakness is rather in the self-description itself, 'that most undramatic of all mannerism,' as Blackie justly calls it, than in the adverb. In Cho. 423, sqq. visible acts are described as repeated.

V. 115. Here, as on v. 108, Mr. Paley withdraws a suspicion formerly expressed against the text—this time, we think, not quite so wisely. Hermann's ἐπιδρομ' ἐπιθι is an infinite improvement on the reading which preceded it, being in closer conformity to the MSS. while it restores the metre and the language; but the sense remains *in statu quo*, not impossible, but very harsh.

Vv. 135—140. These lines are confessedly corrupt, the general sense being clear, but the reading of some of the words doubtful in the last degree. Mr. Paley defends v. 137 as it stands,

referring ἐνώπια to the place where the statue of Artemis was standing, and comparing μάκαρες εὐεδροι in Theb. 97, an interpretation far superior both in external authority and intrinsic appropriateness to the common one, which renders ἐνώπια 'the countenance.' To those who still question the words of the MSS. we beg to offer a suggestion of our own, ἔχουσα σεμνὸν ὄπ' ἀτασθάλους, 'keeping stern looks for the insolent,' which would harmonize well with the preceding line and with the whole context. Ὦπα may be masculine, as it occasionally is in Attic, or σεμνὸς may be a word of two terminations as well as of three, like many others to be found in Æschylus. In the next line Mr. Paley now reads παντὶ δὲ σθένει διωγμοῖς (σθένει 'ν διωγμοῖς was Butler's conjecture); but we doubt the corruption of σθένουσι into σθένει, nor do we see any good construction for the second dative διωγμοῖς. Πάντα δὲ σθένουσ' ἄρωγός, the first part being from Lachmann, has struck us as a possible rather than a likely conjecture. As to the following line we can speak with greater confidence: ἀσφαλέας, for which ἀσφαλῆς, ἀσφαλέως, ἀσμένως, have been proposed, appears to us clearly a mistake for ἄς φίλας, 'her dear one,' the substitution of which would benefit the sense, while it tallies with the MSS. far better than the other words.

V. 146. There can be no doubt that Wellauer's τὸν γαῖον approaches more nearly than Mr. Paley's old reading, τὸν Ζαγρέα, both to the τὸν ταλον of the MSS. and to the τὸν ἀγραῖον of the grammarians; nor does the fact that these latter quote the passage à propos of Zagreus create any great probability that his name was originally found there. Their meaning seems to be no more than this: Zagreus (ὁ μεγάλως ἀγρείων) is an epithet of Pluto: Æschylus in his Sisyphus uses it in conjunction with πολυξένω, if not as a synonyme for it, πολύξενος being elsewhere used to express the same attribute of universal receptiveness in the Egyptians, (Supplices.)

V. 153. Mr. Paley had before adopted Haupt's μαστίκτειρα: he now recalls μάστεϊρ', with an obelus. We have no doubt that the reading of the MSS. is right, though the full force of it has not yet been properly explained. The allusion is to the office of the μαστήρes at Athens, a body (in the words of Liddell and Scott) appointed to seek after public debtors, or to ascertain the fortune of exiles with a view to confiscation. In the present case, the inquisition is after the persons of the exiles: but this need not bar the applicability of the reference. The herald in v. 897 describes himself as a μαστήρ of this kind, by speaking of his patron god, Ἑρμῇ μεγίστῳ προξένῳ μαστηρίῳ. The construction here will then be Ἰοῦς μῆνις μάστεϊρ' ἐκ θεῶν, 'The wrath which attacked Io is sent from the Gods to hunt out me,'—Ἰοῦς ἦνις answering to ἄταν γαμετᾶς in the next sentence.

V. 181. Mr. Paley properly remarks on *ὀπτήρες εἶεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, with which he compares *δὲνρ' ἐποπτεύσαι*, Cho. 583. The common Greek phrase, *θεωρεῖν εἰς ἀγῶνας*, is another instance of the same thing.

V. 182. We are not sure that *τεθυμμένος* is the best correction that has been proposed for the unintelligible *τεθειμένος* of the MSS. The confusion between *υ* and *ει* is easy enough, and has in fact actually taken place in the Aldine text of the preceding verse, where *πεπεισμένοι* is found instead of *πεπυσμένοι*; but the word itself is not very common, and the use of the compound *ἐπι-τεθυμμένος* in Plat. Phædr. § 8, is scarcely parallel, as there a play is specially intended on the name of Typhon, so that the sense may be a little strained. Pearson's *τεθηγμένος* is unexceptionable in itself, and at least equally near to the old reading, the difference between *ΕΓ* (as it would originally be written) and *ΕΙ* being next to nothing. It may stand alone as well as *τεθυμμένος*, so that we need not trouble ourselves about its relation to *ὠμῇ ξὺν ὀργῇ*, even if we should agree with Mr. Paley that the preposition is a decided bar to the construction of those words with a passive participle, which, in the face of the various instances adduced of the instrumental or quasi-instrumental use of *σύν*, we should be scarcely prepared to do.

V. 185. We are sorry that Mr. Paley's judgment has not been proof against Professor Blackie's arguments in defence of the old interpretation of *ἀγόνιοι θεοὶ*, 'the gods of contests.' To say that the Chorus, being themselves engaged in an *ἀγὼν βίου*, would naturally invoke the gods of contests, is a little far-fetched, when we consider that the *ἀγῶνες* in question are the public games. Nor do we attribute much weight to Mr. Paley's remark, that the four gods afterwards invoked (vv. 206—216) happen to be the patrons of the great Grecian games. In Agam. 513, *all* the *ἀγόνιοι θεοὶ* are invoked in a body, Zeus and Apollo having been previously addressed separately, while Hermes is mentioned immediately afterwards—a proof that the term is not there meant to be coextensive with the four deities.

V. 190. Mr. Paley, as we have seen on v. 8, now defends *τὰ χρεῖ'*, which he formerly proposed to get rid of either by correction or by expunging the whole verse. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that the article can have been added without any object to the third of a string of adjectives connected by *καὶ*, in spite of Theb. 315, to which we recommend Mr. Paley to add Cho. 728, *χθόνιον δ' Ἑρμῆν καὶ τὸν νύχιον*: and the only attempt that has been made to give a force to the article here, that of Bothe, fails in so far as it imposes a sense on *χρεῖος* which it cannot bear immediately below in v. 198. Mr. Paley's own conjecture, *ζάχρει'*, is so good, that we wonder his parental partiality did not lead him to adopt it rather than defend a very doubtful position.

V. 194. Mr. Paley has a very satisfactory note on the peculiar use of μάταιος and similar words, such as μῶρος, ἀνους, ἄφρων, ἀνόητος, in the sense of irregular passion, which, like him, we commend to the 'lector studiosus.' The use is an unquestionable one, and yet very liable to be overlooked, like that of πλεονεξία in S. Paul's Epistles.

V. 195. This line might have given Mr. Paley an opportunity of noticing the different forces of ἐκ and παρὰ with the genitive. The expression was to come *out* of the brow, *from* beside the eye. To the instances which he collects to prove that the Greeks made the eyes the seat of modesty, add Aristot. Rhet. ii. 6. 18, who quotes as a proverb, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶναι αἰδῶ, though he seems to understand it of the eyes not of the bashful person, but of those before whom bashfulness is felt.

V. 203. Scholefield and Mr. Paley are surely right in removing this line from after v. 206 to its present place, so as to make ἴδουτο follow ἴδοι just as συγγνωῖτο follows συγγνώη, vv. 211, 212. Admitting this instance of confusion, we can hardly plead the authority of the MSS. against Mr. Paley's transposition of vv. 209, 210. To place the three lines 209—211 in the mouth of the Chorus, as is commonly done, is to violate the symmetry of the Dialogue: while there is something harsh in supposing with Scholefield the line ἀγνόν τ' Ἀπόλλω to be spoken by Danaus. The objection, however, to the commonly received order, that it introduces an absurd designation of the sun as Ζηνὸς ὄρνις, does not seem convincing. Whether or no any faith is to be put in the equivocal sense of the word ἀλέκτωρ, we can readily see how the sun might come to be called ὄρνις, as the eagle is called Διὸς κύων—both of them terms not strictly applicable, but conveying the general notion of ministering, and themselves used by the tragedians with very considerable latitude of meaning. Ζηνὸς ὄρνις and ἀγνός Ἀπόλλων must then be considered as two different titles of the same god, coupled by τε as in vv. 41, 60—not an unnatural supposition when we consider that Danaus is interpreting the Greek deities by his Egyptian notions. Possibly some actual symbol may be intended: but this we throw out merely as a conjecture. A further confirmation of the common view may be derived from the word σωτηρίους, which looks as if it might refer to the delegated power of Zeus σωτήρ, given in this case to the sun as the minister of Zeus as it is given in Cho. 2. to Hermes, πατρὶ' ἐποπτεύων κράτη. These considerations appear sufficient to make us hesitate before we reject the old interpretation, which comes to us with a traditional authority from the scholiast. Otherwise we might easily acquiesce in the propriety and simplicity of Mr. Paley's view, making Ζηνὸς ὄρνις the eagle, which is represented on the altar of Zeus as his symbol, as the trident is on that of Neptune, v. 214. Even then, how-

ever, two important objections would have to be removed—first the improbability that Danaus would direct the Chorus to invoke the eagle, especially after Zeus himself had just been formally invoked; and secondly, the fact that the Chorus takes no notice whatever of the request, but proceeds at once to address the sun.

V. 220. Mr. Paley appears now to have got rid of the difficulty which he formerly found in the words *κίρκων τῶν ὁμοπτέρων φόβῳ κ.τ.λ.* The fact is simply that there is a slight confusion between the *εἰκὼν* and the *μεταφορά*, the sentence beginning with the first, *ἔσμὸς ὡς πελειάδων*, and then passing into the second. Sophocles (*Ajax*, 168) furnishes us with a precise parallel, *Παταγούσιν ἅτε πτηνῶν ἀγέλαι· Μέγαν αἰγυπτιὸν δ' ὑποδείσαντες Τάχ' ἂν ἐξαίφνης εἰ σὺ φανεῖης Σιγῇ πτήξειαν ἄφωνοι.* In the present passage of course the similitude is not quite perfect, as the prohibition of intercourse between hawks and doves is not founded on their affinity but on their absolute diversity. The notion contained in *ὁμοπτέρων*, however, is exactly expressed by Juvenal's '*Parcit cognatis maculis similis fera*,' which Stanley quotes on v. 222.

V. 223. Mr. Paley does not notice Dindorf's adoption of the unauthorized alteration *ἄκοντος πατρὸς for παρά*: he might, however, have done well to protest against it, as one of many similar pieces of rashness in which this Editor has recently indulged. *Γαμεῖν τινα παρά τινος* evidently means to marry a woman from her father's house, so that while the two readings come exactly to the same thing, that of the MSS. is much more idiomatic and appropriate.

V. 225. *Μάταιος αἰτίαν* was proposed by Mr. Paley in a review some time before Linwood suggests it in his *Lexicon*. We prefer it decidedly to the other conjecture, *ματαίων αἰτίας*.

V. 226. A comparison of the various MSS. readings, *ταπλα ἐν μακῶς, τα πλα ενμαβῶς, ταπλὰ ἐνμὰ ὡς, τὰπλὰ ἐγμάβας*, with the incontestibly genuine *τὰπλακήμαθ' ὡς*, first restored by Stephens, may show not only the impossibility of maintaining the authority of MSS. in all cases against that of critics, but the necessity of occasionally admitting conjectures which have few, if any, palæographical considerations to support them. The differences of the old readings among themselves are easily accounted for: but the difference between any one of them and Stephens' restoration is one not easily to be explained by the ordinary instances of confusion of letters. Doubtless the transcriber thought he was copying correctly, as he does not seem to have been misled by any definite notions of making sense of the passage: but we cannot tell in what state the original words may have presented themselves to him, nor on what principle he is likely to have attempted to deal with them.

V. 228. We think Mr. Paley ought to have adopted Stanley's *τρόπον* for *τόπον*. The latter is of course defensible *per se*, but less likely under the circumstances. The Chorus would most naturally have taken their place as soon as they heard their father's direction a few lines above. On the other hand, the use of *ἀμείβεσθε*, v. 191, points strongly to the sense of *answering*. If it be objected that Danaus has ceased for some time to give any directions about the tone of their reply, we may observe with Schutz, that the lines immediately preceding contain the plea which he wishes them to urge, though not expressed in the way of dictation; and, further, that the present verse has the appearance of being spoken just as the king is perceived to be approaching—'Take care, and answer as I bade you just now.'

V. 230. *στόλον*, in the sense of a 'company,' is harsh after *ὄμιλον*, though perhaps to be defended by the instances of pleonasm given by Porson on Phœn. 22. It seems better to understand it as an 'equipment,' not precisely identical with *στολή*, but nearly equivalent to *οἱ ἐσταλμένοι*. This seems the meaning of the word in v. 2 above—an expedition, with special reference to the nautical sense of *στέλλειν*, which may also be that intended here. 'Ἀνέλληνα στόλον then will mean *ἀνελληνικῶς ἐσταλμένοι*, 'Accoutred as for a journey in other than Greek fashion.' Otherwise *στολήν* might be conjectured, with some plausibility, to be constructed, not with *ἀνέλληνα*, but in the manner indicated by the Schol., *τὸν οὐχ Ἑλληνα κατὰ στολήν*.

V. 240. Mr. Paley's punctuation after *τάλλα* removes a difficulty which could not but be felt so long as the word was supposed to be connected with *πολλά*,—the position of the article.

V. 244. We agree with Mr. Paley in having some doubt about *τηρὸν*, though his correction, *τηρόραβδον ἱρὸν*, strikes us as rather hazardous. Possibly *ὀτρηρὸν ἱροραβδον* (*ὀτρηρὸς* being the Homeric epithet of *θεράπων*) might be read, so as to make the clause an epexegetis of *ἔτην*, which would thus be more directly contrasted with *πόλεως ἀγόν*. But the state of the MSS. reading *ἡτηρὸν ἡεροῦ* (al. *κέρου* or *έρμου*) *ράβδον*, renders all attempts at emendation extremely uncertain.

V. 247. In spite of Mr. Paley's reasoning, Canter's correction, *Πελασγός*, seems to us indisputable. To suppose, with Haupt, that the king intentionally avoids a direct mention of his name, is utterly gratuitous and unmeaning. In the very next line he states it plainly, not, as Mr. Paley says, 'satis ambigue:' the fact that he is elsewhere spoken of by other designations, looks like a mere accident, and is proved to be such by v. 987, the force of which cannot fairly be got rid of: and the only positive evidence for this intentional concealment, v. 915, is an exception which proves the rule, resting as it does on a special reason.

Πελασγοῦ γῆς, like Ἰνδοῦς γυναικάς below, v. 280, which is merely an instance of the common confusion between *ου* and *α*, in our judgment is quite inadmissible. Ἑλλην appears to stand on different ground, being a masculine adjective with a single termination, not the masculine form of an adjective with three

V. 250. ἀγνός, J. Wordsworth's unquestionable emendation of ἄλγος, mentioned by Dindorf in the preface to his new edition of Æschylus, does not seem to have been known to Mr. Paley. The discovery that τὸ, not τοῦ, was originally the Medicean reading for τε in the next line places it beyond doubt.

V. 262. We prefer Mr. Paley's μηνιτὶ, though a word occurring nowhere else, to the other alterations proposed for the old μηνεῖται. Dindorf's μηνιαῖ ἄκη is especially unhappy, the fancy of a monthly visitation being wholly unauthorized, and the word ἄκη inapplicable. Of the latter objection he has since become so far sensible that he now prints ἄχη. Perhaps in a third edition he will venture to depart yet further from the original, and read ἄγη, as he has substituted ἄγος for ἄχος in Agam. 1251, 1579.

V. 263. The mere run of the verse, so far as that can tell us what is likely to have been written by Æschylus, seems rather in favour of the old δράκονθ' ὀμίλον, which Mr. Paley now rejects. But it is difficult to find a parallel in defence of the expression: λεὼς ἱππότας, Theb. 80, perhaps comes nearest to it, as being a case of a noun of multitude joined with an adjectival substantive in the singular: but it may be questioned whether the word ἱππότας was not originally more of an adjective than a substantive.

V. 267. The MSS. reading πονταντινεισθον looks at first sight as if the word may once have been αἰμνησθον, but there can be no doubt that ἀντίμισθον is the right interpretation of the letters.

V. 268. It seems easier to believe, as Mr. Paley once did, that ἔχουσ' has been at one time or another corrupted into ἔχον δ', the text of Med., than, as he now does, that the king directs his question to Danaus, who is prevented from answering him by scenic considerations. The supposition that in v. 241, above, φθόγγος means ὁ φθεγγόμενος, the masculine *par excellence*, is, as far as we know, totally unsupported.

V. 281. Stanley's ἀστραβιζούσας ought to have been adopted, as without it there seems no reasonable construction for καμήλοις. The perverse readiness of transcribers to put a word in the same case with that which precedes it is well known.

V. 291. The reading of this line seems quite hopeless. We can hardly go wrong in correcting κού for καὶ with Stanley. Κρυπτά Ἥρας is a perfectly defensible construction, occurring in Soph. Elect. 159: but whether we prefer it to κρύβδα must

depend on our view of the rest of the line. Here ταῦτα παλλάγματων is the text of the MSS. : Turnebe filled up the vacancy with τῶν : others have endeavoured to supply it by altering παλλάγματων. πάλλαγμα, however, appears to be a better word than any of those which have been suggested in its room, being in strict analogy with πάλλαξ, παλλακή : so that if we do not accept τῶν we may suppose the fault to be in ταῦτα, for which we might have expected some verb like ἔθιγε in sense. The genitive termination looks genuine : too much so to allow us to see much probability in Mr. Paley's ταῦτα παλλακεύματ' ἦν. If it could be got rid of, we should prefer ταῦτ' ἔτλη παλλάγματα, supposing the verb to have been lost through the similarity of the letters.

V. 295. Mr. Paley's note convinces us that Schutz's ἔτ' is right.

V. 316. πάνσοφον is palpably wrong : nor does πανσόφον, which Mr. Paley receives from Tyrwhitt, appear to mend matters much. Schutz's τὸ πᾶν σαφῶς is better : but what force is there in the injunction to the Danaïdes to speak 'with perfect plainness?' It has occurred to us to read πάντροφον—not an unlikely word for the king to have used in reference to the father of the vast company which he saw before him, and confirmed by the way in which the Chorus give their answer, 'Danaus—and he has a brother who has also 50 children.' The epithet would naturally be used with ὄνομα, because the family would have to be spoken of by the patronymic when addressed as a whole. The old reading and interpretation of Theb. 294 may be adduced in support of this conjecture, even by those who prefer to read πάντρομος.

Vv. 331—3. The difficulties of these lines seem to us by no means to be as yet cleared up. We hardly see our way towards the adoption of Boissonade's ὄνοιτο, plausible as it is, and accepted by the subsequent editors. As he remarks, the sense of v. 331 would then be 'κατ' ἐχθρὰν nempe : ' but this is scarcely to be reconciled with the express assertion of the Chorus in v. 37, and of Danaus in v. 221, that one at least of the preventing causes was τὸ μὴ θέμις : nor is there much force in v. 332, if taken as a remark upon such an answer. The old reading, ἀνοῦτο, is preferable, so far as it includes the notion of too close affinity among the objections to the marriage, φίλος being constantly used (*e. g.* in Cho. 234, Eum. 119) for relationship, without any reference to kind feeling : but the language would lead us to make φίλους the predicate and τοὺς κεκτημένους the subject rather than the reverse. To this it may perhaps be replied that φίλους may very well stand without the article, as in the passage from the Eumenides just quoted, Soph. Elect. 518, &c. &c. ; while κεκτημένος, being a participle, requires the article to make it into a substantive even in the predicate. The king's

remark would then be an appeal to prudential considerations, and the rejoinder of the Chorus an endeavour to meet him on his own ground. In spite of Mr. Paley's altered judgment, *εὐμαρὴς ἀπαλλαγὴ* seems to us best explained by *ῥάδιοι ἀπαλλαγὰι*, Eur. Med. 1375; though the parallel would have been more exact had the plural been used here. At the same time, we neither take v. 333 ironically with Scholefield, nor understand *δυστυχοῦντων* of the husbands, with Mr. Paley in his first edition. The line need mean no more than, 'Yes; and it is no less true that the wretched can easily be got rid of.' If, following Schutz and Mr. Paley's second thoughts, we supposed the words to convey a reproach to the king, for the case with which he settles the case of the unfortunate, we should not be able so well to account for the form of the answer, *καὶ—γε*.

V. 349. We can scarcely understand Mr. Paley's refusal to accept Bamberger's *νεῦνθ'*, which he ought at any rate to have mentioned. The objection to taking *ἑμίλον* of the gods is little better than a cavil, and may at once be obviated by considering the use of *ὁμιλία*, Prom. 59, of two gods, Eum. 57, of goddesses, Eur. Hipp. 1441, of a goddess and a mortal. In the old reading, besides the harshness of *τε* in any case, which, though defensible by other instances, is not a thing to be embraced unnecessarily by a critic, there is the special impropriety of coupling two such attributes as that of being crowned with suppliant boughs and that of youth, the mention of the last of which would here be a mere impertinence.

V. 355. *γεραίοφρων*, Burges' correction of *γεραφρονῶν*, does not altogether answer to the strophe: *γεραρὰ φρονῶν*, or *γεραροφρονῶν* (if the latter may be introduced *pro hac vice*), would fulfil this requisite, and also approach nearer to the old text.

V. 370. We should prefer *τοῖς ἐμοὶ παλιγκότοις*, as otherwise *παλίγκοτος* must be taken as a substantive, like *ἔχθρος*—a use which there seems no authority for attributing to it. The passage from Pind. Nem. iv. *fin.* does not prove this.

V. 380. So far as the sense goes, Mr. Paley is right in preferring Porson's *δυσπαράβελκτοις* to Schutz's *δυσπαράβελκτος*, which, though, perhaps, countenanced by the Scholiast, would prevent our giving *μένει* its natural sense. But we would rather believe with Burges that Æschylus wrote *δυσπαράβελκτους* than that he did not care to avoid the confusion of datives, for which Agam. 426, if the text is sound, supplies a parallel, but not an excuse.

V. 388. The use of *ὀρίζομαι* is not rightly explained by Mr. Paley, 'mihī eligo: proprie terminos statuo: deinde in universum definitio, faciendum mihī assigno.' The word, if we mistake not, is used not in a universal, but in a special sense, and should be

closely connected with ὑπαστρον, in the manner already pointed out by the Scholiast, τὴν τοῦ γάμου μηχανὴν ὀριοῦμαι τοῖς ἀστροῖς. With this exception, we entirely agree with Mr. Paley's general view of the passage. In paraphrasing it, the important words would be, ὑπαστρον and δὺσφρονος. 'I hate the marriage: and therefore it is that, as an expedient of escape, I throw myself on the guidance of the stars, and fly.'

V. 393. Under the circumstances, Mr. Paley has, perhaps, been well advised in retaining καὶ μήποτε, not as intrinsically preferable to Canter's μὴ καίποτε, or Wordsworth's κοῦ μήποτε, but as defensible, at the same time that it avoids the necessity of choosing between two evenly balanced conjectures. We have just before seen κοῦ confused with καὶ, v. 291.

V. 396. Mr. Paley explains and illustrates the use of τάδε as an adverbial, or rather cognate accusative—a construction apparently misunderstood by Dindorf, who records Bamberger's and Schutz's corrections of ἀμφοτέρους, thereby implying an opinion that some correction is necessary. We approve, too, of Mr. Paley's second thoughts in making ὁμαίμων an epithet of Ζεὺς. Compare Soph. Ant. 486, εἴθ' ὁμαιμονεστέρα τοῦ παντός ἡμῖν Ζηνὸς ἐρκέλου κυρεῖ.

V. 403. We see no sufficient reason for suspecting ὥνωμένον. The eye that would penetrate a depth must not be giddy; and to connect giddiness with drunkenness is so common, as to need no illustration. Catullus expressly speaks of *ebrii ocelli*, the only difference being, that the giddiness there is the effect of passion. Mr. Paley's ἄνω μένον, an improvement on Boissonade's ἄνω μένειν, is much less forcible than ὥνωμένον, and objectionable, moreover, as containing an antithesis not to δεδορκός, which is its corresponding epithet, but to ἐς βυθὸν μολεῖν.

V. 425. Mr. Paley leaves the present verse as it stands, 'acquiescing gladly' in Klausen's correction ὁμοῖαν in the antistrophic v. 430. For our own part, we should prefer to leave the latter undisturbed; as, without entering on the question of the legitimacy of the Ionic form, we see no reason for spoiling the dochmiac metre. What to do with the former is by no means clear, as the words are perfectly good in themselves, independently of the metrical objection. Neither Seidler's experiment in quantity, nor Bothe or Bamberger's in language, seems to us satisfactory. Ἀμπύκων is too well chosen a word to be referable to a gloss or a corruption, otherwise we might read πλόκων, and thus complete the parallel with Theb. 328. In v. 429, Mr. Paley's improved judgment has led him to abandon ἄρ' ἐκτίνειν for Seidler's Ἀρεῖ κτίνειν. Bothe's original proposal, δόρι τίνειν, would answer more completely to the metre of the strophe; but we need not infringe on the customary latitude of dochmiacs.

Vv. 437—442. On the whole, we think that Dindorf has suggested the best way of dealing with this most difficult passage, by omitting altogether the two obnoxious lines, 438 and 442. Very little is gained by transposition: if v. 438 be placed after v. 439, it will be felt to be superfluous at best, not to mention the extreme uncertainty of the reading; if v. 441 and v. 442 change places, there is a surplusage of a similar kind, and *μη τὰ καίρια* has to be taken for *τὰ μὴ καίρια*. Mr. Paley adopts the latter remedy, but not the former, in the place of which he corrects v. 438 into *αὐτῆς τε μεῖζω καὶ μέγ' ἐμπλήσαι γέμος*, as if the adverbial use of *μέγα* constituted the main objection to the MSS. text. The Scholiast, as Dindorf remarks, appears to have found in his copy *αὐτῆς γεμίζων καὶ μέγ' ἐμπλήσας γόμον*, and this would seem to be the most probable reading, if we look merely to the line itself. We may suppose then, that it came somehow to be inserted in the margin from another place, perhaps by a person who recollected the parallel passage, *Agam. 1008*; thence it might slip into the text, when *γε μεῖζω* would be the obvious correction of an unskilful critic. If we apply a similar hypothesis to v. 442, we may say that its introduction was probably owing to certain verbal parallels between it and the lines before and after, *e.g.* the word *κάρτα*, the verbal *κινητήρια*, compared with *θελκτήριος* and *χρηστήρια*, and perhaps *θυμοῦ*, which may point to a various reading of *μύθον* in v. 441. Reverting to a minor point, we agree with Mr. Paley in retaining *χρήμασιν—πορθομένων*, in v. 437, as Æschylus in many other places shows an unaccountable fondness for the genitive absolute, when he might have been expected to put the participle in some other case.

V. 450. We had thought of reading *ἀκούσομαι λέγοις ἄν*: but Wakefield's *χὰ λέγοις ἄν* seems more likely. Mr. Paley keeps the common reading without a word.

V. 460. May not *μακιστήρ* have been an arrow of unusual length, as our old writers talk of a *cloth-yard shaft*?

V. 462. *πολλαχῇ* looks genuine, though *καὶ—μὴν* would be better than *καὶ—μέν*. On the whole, we think Mr. Paley's suspicions of the text as he has given it unreasonable.

V. 473. We doubt exceedingly the propriety of turning these words, with Mr. Paley, into a general reflection. Not only the use of the word *ὑψιστος*, but the introduction of the sentiment itself seems to us unnatural—the invention of a modern, not the thought of an ancient. *Φόβος* we take as an 'object of terror,' as if it had been written *ὑψιστον σέβας*, the subject being *Ζεὺς ἱκτῆρ*, or, *ὁ Διὸς ἱκτῆρος κότος*.

V. 474. It does not seem necessary to read *σὺ μὴν* with Mr. Paley. There is nothing unheard of in the occurrence of *μέν* without its corresponding *δέ*, especially when, as he admits, the

apodosis may be so easily understood, αἱ δὲ ἐνταῦθα μενόντων. Κλάδους τε, too, we think genuine, though we should not seek to explain it by connecting the clause with μηδ' ἀπορρίφθῃ λόγος, which apparently belongs to the preceding words ὡς ἴδωσι. We have already, on v. 52, alluded to the Æschylean use of τε with a verb after a participle; and the fact, that in the present sentence τε precedes the participle, need not prevent us from regarding this as a case of the same kind, since, by placing a comma after τούτους, we may make the construction equivalent to λαβὲ θές τε, or λαβὼν εἶτα θές. Μηδ' ἀπορρίφθῃ λόγος ἐμοῦ we prefer on the whole to understand with Bothe, 'and that no word of me may be let fall,' as the sense thus seems best to accord with the words which follow. It may be a question whether ἐμοῦ is to be constructed with λόγος, and not rather with ἀπορρίφθῃ, after the analogy of the genitive after βάλλειν, ἰέναι, and other words mentioned in Jelf, Gr. Gr. § 506.

V. 480. Linwood's correction, οἰκτίσας, ἰδὼν τάδε, strikes us as much more probable than ἔκτορ' εἰσιδὼν, which, though no longer holding a place in Mr. Paley's text, is still approved in his notes.

V. 485. How a man of Mr. Paley's judgment can hesitate about admitting Porson's εὐρεθέντα is to us a matter of astonishment. The defences that have been set up for εὐ ρέοντα will not bear a moment's examination. 'Ρέω, meaning 'to flow,' does not appear to be connected in any way with the root of εἶρηκα. It is applied metaphorically to speech, to the organs of speech, and sometimes, though rarely, to the speaker—the object being to express in each case the attribute which we distinguish by the corresponding name of *fluency*. But it is obvious that Danaus here does not mean to call the king his *fluent* patron, even if the metaphor, which is not so completely naturalized in Greek as in English, were admissible in a passage where no particular stress is laid on the epithet: and to say that εὐ ρεῖν can be used of the goodness of a speech relatively to its matter, is as reasonable as it would be to assert that the verb *to flow* is with us convertible with the verb *to speak*.

V. 492. We do not see the reason for exchanging φόβον for φόνον. Danaus says, that ill-judged confidence may issue in alarm, for men have been known to put their friends to death in ignorance. The sense is perfectly clear without the alteration, which might be objected to as stating the speaker's apprehension too plainly, and as anticipating the more direct language of the next line.

V. 502. Mr. Paley has at length succeeded in reconciling the two senses of λευρός, which he now renders, 'latus et apertus.' He still appears, however, to have some difficulty in applying the

epithet to ἄλσος, remarking, that a place overgrown with trees could not be called level and open. We would refer him to Mr. Stanley's explanation of the word in his article on Greek Topography in the *Classical Museum* (vol. i. p. 65), where he speaks of it as 'a natural τέμενος, a retired basin in the bosom of the mountains, interspersed but never overgrown with trees'—the Latin *saltus*, in short, and proceeds to show its peculiar applicability to the plain of Marathon.

V. 507. We can scarcely doubt that Bothe, in his first edition, was right in reading φρένας, though the conjecture is not mentioned by Mr. Paley.

V. 508. We prefer Schutz's interpretation, 'the fear of kings is ever excessive.' The sentiment may be supported from Persæ 694, *sqq.*, though the language there is much stronger, corresponding to the difference between an Asiatic despotism and an European monarchy, such as this of Pelasgus is described to be. Of course, the fear here felt is not simply of the person of the king; but it is true, nevertheless, that the distance between the monarch and the suppliant constitutes one reason why the latter should hesitate to rely on the assurances of the former. Linwood's γυναικῶν, however, may be worth considering.

V. 509. If a correction be needed, φρένα seems more natural than φρενοῦ, in spite of Mr. Paley's remark that the former would hardly have been corrupted into φρενι—an objection which assumes a greater uniformity in the laws of textual corruption than we are at present prepared to admit. But we do not wholly give up φρενι, which may be taken either with εὐφραive or with πρᾶσσων. The difficulty is, that it does not seem to cohere very naturally with a verb expressing action: a case in point, however, is Cho. 303, and perhaps 1004.

V. 521. In his first edition, Mr. Paley appeared to have taken γένεσθω under his patronage, mainly because other parts of the verb had been unfairly used in other passages of Æschylus. He now admits the probability of Lobeck's γένει σῶ, which before had only obtained from him the praise of being 'ingenious.' We should make little question about adopting it, our doubt, if any, arising wholly from the existence of a rival conjecture, γενέθλω, and in no way from any consideration which can be adduced in favour of the old reading.

V. 525. Here Mr. Paley is plainly right. Τὸ πρὸς γυναικῶν comes in after ἀνδρῶν, v. 522, as naturally as words can, in spite of Dindorf's dogmatic 'γυναικῶν vocabulum corruptum.'

V. 527. We are surprised that Mr. Paley, constructing γένος with νέωσον, should call it an accusative in opposition to αἶνον. The construction is clearly the same as in Soph. Elect. 124, *sqq.* τάκεις οἰμωγὰν . . . Ἀγαμέμνονα—a construction difficult to

analyse exactly, but explained sufficiently for practical purposes by the *πρὸς τὸ σημαίνον* principle, which would make *νέωσον αἶνον* = *αἶνει*, just as there *τάκεις οἰμωγὰν* = *οἰμώζεις*.

V. 529. Mr. Paley should, at any rate, have mentioned Hermann's *πολυμνήστορ* for *πολυμνήτωρ*, a reading adopted by Dindorf so long ago as his first edition on metrical grounds, and altogether strongly supported by critical probability.

V. 530. We leave the metrical question between *δι' αἶς* and *δίας*, to be argued out between Dindorf and Mr. Paley, merely remarking that, *cæteris paribus*, we should be glad to be spared the construction proposed by the latter, *εὐχόμεθα γένος ἀπὸ τᾶσδε εἶναι*, *ἔνοικοι δίας γᾶς*, which it is evident that nothing less than violence could have extorted from the Greek.

V. 533. If *ἐπωπὰς* is to be defended, it must be on the ground taken by Mr. Paley, 'the watchings of Io' being considered equivalent to 'the places where Io was watched;' but this does not quite satisfy us, though we have no correction to suggest.

V. 535. Mr. Paley's *ἐρεθομένα* is in itself as good a substitution for *ἐρεσσομένα* as could be wished. We should at once pronounce it right, were it not that the similarity of the metre of this line, according to the old reading, to that of the next, creates a probability that it is rather the antistrophe which requires change.

V. 546. 'Libri Παμφύλων τε γένη. Corruptus est hic versus, 'Παμφύλων enim non respondet strophico v. neque credibile est 'scripsisse poetam Παμφυλίων.' The metre would be restored by reading *Παφλαγόνων*, which would further account for the intrusive *γένη*; but Io is more likely to have traversed Pamphyly than Paphlagonia, and it would be too much to suppose that *Παμφύλων γένη* was introduced by some copyist who felt the geographical difficulty. Possibly *Παφλαγόνων* may have been a various reading for *Παμφυλίων*, or *Παμφύλων*, and *γένη* may have crept in through the confusion; or *γένη* may be a gloss for *φῦλα*, a word which, with its epithet, may have been corrupted into *Παμφύλων*. But speculation is useless in a case like this.

V. 554. We think Mr. Paley right in adopting, as he now does, Schutz's *ὑδωρ τε Νείλου*, so as to make *τυφῶ μένος* the nominative, as the typhoon is one of the natural phenomena of Egypt. At the same time *μένος* would make a perfectly good and appropriate construction after *ἐπέρχεται*, as he remarks, though he does not explain that it would then be a cognate accusative.

V. 556. Mr. Paley deserves credit for seeing that *κεντροδαλίτοις* should be *κεντροδάλητος*, *θυιὰς* being a corruption of some word beginning with a vowel, of the quantity - - -. We do not,

however, like his *ἔθνευ*, though we have not been able to think of anything better.

V. 561. Mr. Paley has silently changed the punctuation of his first edition so as to connect *ὄψιν ἀήθη* with *πάλλουτ'* rather than with *ἐσορῶντες*. The construction is thus rendered less obvious, but more idiomatic, being, in fact, substantially the same as that noticed just above on v. 528.

V. 570. *Βία* does not seem to refer so much to the violence inflicted on Io from without, as to her own frenzied wildness. This yields a proper antithesis between *βία* and *ἀπημάντω σθένει*, which answers to *ἀταρβεί χειρὶ*, Prom. 849, (a line unaccountably called in question by Dindorf.) Compare also v. 92 above, *βίαν δ' οὐτιν' ἐξοπλίζει*, well rendered by Mr. Blackie, 'No force he wields; his simple will, His quiet sentence blasteth.'

V. 586. Mr. Paley proposes to complete this line by reading *αὐτόχειρ πάντων ἀναξ*. The antistrophic v. 591 makes it more probable that the deficiency is to be supplied by inserting a dactyl at the beginning.

V. 589. On this disputed passage we are happy to agree with Mr. Paley. Buttman appears to us to have established satisfactorily the sense of *θαάξειν*, and the context here clearly requires the notion of *sitting*. The same considerations determine the sense of *τὸ μείον κρείσσόνων κρατύνει*, which must refer to Zeus' exercise of his own power; not, as Dindorf thinks, to his promotion of the weak above the strong. We see no occasion either to follow Dindorf in his hasty and ill-advised condemnation of v. 591, where the genitive absolute instead of the accusative after the verb is quite in the manner of Æschylus.

V. 594. Here we prefer Dindorf's punctuation, connecting *τὰ τῶν ἐγχωρίων* with *θαρσεῖτε*, as more idiomatic than either of the two successively adopted by Mr. Paley.

V. 600. "*Ὡστ'*, the reading of the Med. MS. and Robertelli, makes, as Mr. Paley remarks, strongly for Tyrwhitt's *ἀνηβήσαι με*. At the same time we agree with him that the construction of the old reading, *ὡς ἂν ἡβήσαιοιμι*, is perfectly good, though less usual. He goes on to state his opinion on the subject at some length in an Excursus to which we on the whole subscribe, at the same time that we think some of his distinctions unnecessary. Our view is simply this. '*Ὡς*, as the adverb of the relative, properly means, 'in which manner.' In independent clauses, it introduces a comparison, or analogy of some kind, not only with the indicative, but with other words. Thus *ὅπως*, which follows the same rule, is used in Ag. 363 with the optative and *ἂν*, merely to express a comparison, while *ὡς* performs a similar office with the conjunctive and *ἂν* in Eum. 33. In subjoined clauses, *ὡς* and *ὅπως* express either a result or a purpose; but

they do so, not from any change in their own meaning, but simply because the clause is subjoined, and the moods are used in a different sense from that which they would bear in an independent sentence. Accordingly, there are cases where, even in translating subjoined clauses, something more of the original adverbial force requires to be brought out than appears in the ordinary renderings 'that,' or 'in order to.' So, if we retain *ὥς ἂν ἡβήσαιμι* in the present line, we shall find that *ὥς* gains a peculiar propriety by being viewed in connexion with *διχορρόπως*, 'The decision was given in no equivocal manner, but in such a manner as to make a young man of me.' What is the force of *ἂν* is another question with which we need not meddle, though we confess to a suspicion that its presence or absence makes no difference in the sense of a conditional clause, it being not the cause of the contingency, but the sign of one already existing, just as propositions are rightly said not to determine but to indicate the case or relation of the noun.

V. 611. This passage has been generally despaired of; but, in spite of the tone of diminished confidence in which Mr. Paley now speaks, we think that he has removed all difficulty by reading *προφωνῶν* with Canter, and rendering *παχύναι* 'sinere ditiescere.' He has not remarked, however, on the confirmation which this reference to the Herodotean sense of *οἱ παχεῖς* receives from the word *βόσκημα* in v. 614. The disease is to be a drain on the body politic, exhausting its powers of support, and preventing it from thriving or becoming fat. Cf. Soph. Phil. 313, *Βόσκων τὴν ἀδηφάγον νόσον*. Ib. 1167. *Οἰκτρά γάρ βόσκειν, ἀδαῆς δ' ἔχειν μυρίον ἄχθος, ᾧ ξυνοικεῖ*.

V. 620. *Ἀγαθὸν ποιᾶς* is not in opposition to *εὐχὰς*, but a cognate after *λέξωμεν*. Cf. Prom. 563, *τίνας ἀμπλακίας ποινὰς ὀλέκει*;

Vv. 626, 627. These lines appear to us more difficult than many on which the commentators have bestowed more labour. That *τὸν ἄχορον βοᾶν* is to be construed with Mr. Paley, 'Cujus clamor non talis est ad quem choreæ ducantur,' we cannot believe; and Bothe's attempt to connect *βοᾶν μάχλον*, 'impotentem inconditi clamoris,' is still less likely. To us, we confess, it seems clear that *βοᾶν κτίσαι* ought to be taken together; and in that case, both the general aspect of the present passage, and the metre of the antistrophe, would lead us to suspect further that *τὸν* should be *τὰν*, so as to make *ἄχορον* an epithet of *βοᾶν*. Thus the shouting of Ares, which leads to no dancing, will become the primary image in the passage; and the epithet *μαχλός*, which doubtless was intended to convey the notion of wanton revelry, will acquire a fresh propriety. But then, what is to be done with v. 626? *Πυρίφατον* seems a genuine word, or

we might suppose the first part of it to have been originally *περὶ*, whatever the second may have been, and compare *περιβόητος*, the epithet of Ares in Soph. Œd. T. 192. Keeping the existing reading, we must apparently have recourse to the hypothesis of a construction like that noticed on v. 527, *κτίσαι βοᾶν πόλιν* being a sufficiently good parallel to *τάκειν οἰμωγὰν Ἀγαμέμνονα*. In any case it appears that *πυρίφατον* must be taken as what we have elsewhere called, after Dr. Donaldson, a tertiary predicate, at least by those who accept, as we are inclined to do, Bamberger's correction of *πράκτορά τε σκοπόν*, v. 635, into *πράκτορ ἄτης κότον*, and are thus compelled to believe that the MSS. are right in inserting *τὰν* here before *Πελασγίαν*, or *Πελασγὰν πόλιν*.

V. 628. We are quite satisfied with the interpretation which makes *ἄλλοις* mean 'other and worse,' or 'unnatural,' as most in accordance not only with the poetical use of *ἄλλος*, or *ἕτερος*, but with the poetical custom of 'coercing,' or qualifying a metaphor, explained by Aristot. Rhet. iii. 6. Mr. Paley's former view, that the verse expresses a wish, is irreconcilable with the words *τὸν θερίζοντα*. His present opinion, that the line is intended to convey a hint, 'he is reaping in other fields, let him stay there,' may stand on grounds of language; but the sense which it gives is inferior in point of force, as it strikes us, to that which we have ventured to prefer.

V. 637. We entirely assent to Mr. Paley's remark, '*Recte explicari non emendari, debebat hic locus,*' and trust it may be understood as a rebuke to the dogmatism of Dindorf, who says of *μαίνοντα* in his notes, '*lectio absurda, probabiliter (!) correctâ ab Schuetzio, qui κοταίνοντα conjecit.*' The two passages cited by Mr. Paley sufficiently prove that *μιάστωρ*=*ἀλάστωρ*: and he might have gone on to show that one of them (Eum. 176) has yet a further point of resemblance to the one before us, as *ἐν κάρᾳ* answers exactly to *ἐπ' ὀρόφων*. That this is not an accidental coincidence will appear, if we refer to another place where this use of *μιάστωρ* occurs, Eur. Med. 1371. *Οἷδ' εἶσιν, οἶμοι* (or more probably *οἶμαι*, after Bothe), *σῶ κάρᾳ μιάστορες*. We may be ignorant of the exact force of the expression, which may, perhaps, be susceptible of illustration from such passages as Soph. Elect. 445; but we cannot doubt that it had some peculiar propriety, and that the connexion here assumed between the top of a building and a polluting presence is anything but fortuitous.

V. 652. In Agam. 722, as in Eur. Supp. 42, we understand *γεραρός* as it is generally understood, of old age: but that does not seem a sufficient reason why we should give it that sense here, where it would be less convenient. It appears to mean

both 'aged' and 'honourable,' a natural connexion in the Greek mind, as Dr. Donaldson remarks, though he will not let the passage in the Agamemnon have the full benefit of it; hence, when it comes to be used substantively in the neuter plural, the sense of 'honours' or 'gifts' is clearly that which is to be expected. We also think Mr. Paley justified in adopting *γερόντων* for *γεμόντων*, from Bothe, and in restoring *τὼς* for *θ' ὡς* from the MSS.

V. 658. Mr. Paley ought, we think, to have adopted Ahrens' easy and simple correction, *δὲ φόρους γὰς*. The MSS. authority in such cases is worth nothing; while the new reading is decidedly more natural than the old, and besides introduces a characteristic opposition between *φόροι γὰς* and *γυναικῶν λόχοι*.

V. 667. As Mr. Paley is now clear as to the truth of *κρατὸς* here, and of *μοῦσαν θέλατ'* in the antistrophe (the corrections respectively of Voss, Ahrens, and Hermann, none of them admitting of a doubt), we do not see why he should have wasted a word in attempting to explain *κράτους*, though the reading which he formerly adopted.

V. 678. Butler's correction, *ἀτρεμαῖα* for *ἀτιμίας* (followed by Mr. Paley), is ingenious, agreeing as it does with the gloss *ἀσφαλίας* and with the explanation of the Scholiast. We do not, however, greatly like the sense thus produced—'populus servet sc. honoret magistratus, h. e. ne in *ἀναρχίαν* ruat.' To us it seems as if the *κοινόμητις ἀρχὰ* referred rather to the king, who, as he told us above, v. 363, acts after communication with the citizens. *Τὸ δὲ δήμιον* then will be the accusative after *φύλασσοι*, the king being bidden to protect the people, wherein the strength of the state lies. For *ἀτιμίας τιμὰς*, we should propose to read *αἰσίμαισι τιμαῖς*,—a very easy correction, and yielding a perfectly good meaning. Cf. Eum. 996. *χαίρετε χαίρετ' ἐν αἰσιμαῖσι πλούτου*. The precise reading of v. 680 cannot well be ascertained, on account of the uncertainty of the antistrophe; but we see no objection to *προμαθεὺς εὐ κοινόμητις*.

V. 694. The case of *λανθάνειν* seems to be like that of *τυγχάνειν*—viz. that it generally takes a participle, but sometimes dispenses with it. Otherwise we might break up the line by a fresh punctuation: *εὐσημον γὰρ, οὐ με λανθάνει*.

V. 698. Scholefield and Mr. Paley are clearly right against Peile (Agam. p. 139), who, independently of any question about his view of the language of the passage, appears to have mistaken the sense. His rendering is 'too well obeying the rudder for an unfriendly one;' where, if he means 'unfriendly to us,' the impression produced by his construction is directly contrary to that intended by *Æschylus*; if 'unfriendly to the rudder,' the general sense is preserved, but a less obvious signification is forced on the words.

Vv. 707—713. Mr. Paley has silently returned to the order of these lines as it stands in the common editions, having before adopted an arrangement of his own, according to which the whole was given to Danaus, except v. 709, the one line of all others which most undoubtedly belongs to him both in sense and in language. With regard, however, to the words *εἰ βραδύνοιμεν βοῇ* he suggested a real difficulty, which he cannot be held to have solved by his present note, '*βοῇ*. Schol. *τῇ βοηθείᾳ*.' The sense must be, not 'if we are slow in getting aid,' a questionable rendering, and implying a contingency of which Danaus, being away, could know nothing; nor 'if we are slow in crying out,' a supposition ridiculous on the face of it, though more easily extracted from the words; but 'if we are slow in bringing succour;'—and this being so, it follows that the line must be spoken by Danaus, who recommends his daughters to cling to the gods in case assistance should be delayed. But we have no doubt that the whole passage really belongs to Danaus from first to last, in spite of the MSS.—a point which surely will be plain to any one who considers the words of the chorus, v. 714. To speak as they do there they must have been silent hitherto—not interrupting with querulous objections, but brooding over their father's warning, and finally breaking out with a lyrical burst of terror, which would lose all its force if it were not their first utterance. There is nothing in the lines preceding to militate against this conviction, but much to confirm it: *γὰρ* in v. 707 is thus shown to have its proper force, and Mr. Paley's *γ' ἂν* appears as unwarrantable in sense as it is unnecessary in language. In v. 709, *ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἔσται τῶνδε* does not mean 'the herald will not come,' but 'he will not accomplish his purpose,' a translation according well with *μὴ τρέσσητέ νιν*. The credit of this discovery, if indeed it presented itself to them in that light, seems to be due to the Aldine editor and Turnèbe, who have been followed by some of the commentators, though without any detailed reasons assigned. Mr. Blackie trusts to his translation to make it evident that the view he has taken is the right one—and it does so.

V. 724. Mr. Paley bids us connect *ὃδ' ἐπιτυχεῖ*, *i.e.* as he construes in his former edition, 'which has thus proved successful.' If we followed him, we should rather take the words to mean, 'which has reached this place.' But the run of the verse shows unmistakeably that *ὃδ'* is to be constructed with *ἐπλευσαν*.

V. 725. We see no reason for suspecting *πολεῖ*. In spite of Dindorf's assertion, it seems to be sufficiently defended by the forms *πολέα* and *πολέων*, and there is an evident reference to it in *πολλοὺς* in the next line.

V. 735. Mr. Paley has omitted his former explanation, '*θεῶν*

σέβη sunt aræ.' From being coupled with *τριαίνας*, the words seem as if they might rather mean the *offices* or *functions* of the gods. But the plural form is so rare as to be doubtful, and ἔδη would be a very easy correction.

V. 743. Ἐχοντας is doubtless the right reading, coming after ὤς. Κράτος appears to us clearly to be a cognate, or, what is the same thing, an adverbial accusative, like τάχος.

V. 744. The use of στολή here, compared with that of στόλος, v. 240, may almost tempt us to suppose that the two can, in some cases at least, be employed convertibly, like ὄχθη and ὄχθος, and perhaps τριβή and τρίβος.

V. 749. Mr. Paley cannot understand how Dindorf (following, it should be mentioned, a suggestion of Bamberger) can propose to remove the full stop from after χθόνα to after ήλίου, unless μολόντες be taken as a 'nominativus pendens.' The case is perfectly clear: μολόντες follows its old construction with ποιμένες, v. 747, and the only difference is that the clause ἐς νύκτ' ἀποστείχοντος ήλίου is taken from a connexion where it would only create a pleonasm, and placed in one where it is really wanted to supply an additional thought. The words φιλεῖ κ.τ.λ. will then form a general statement, subjoined *more Tragicorum* to enforce the particular point just mentioned. The alteration, we are convinced, is one which might occur to any one considering the passage with attention: indeed, it occurred to us before we observed it in Dindorf's notes.

V. 756. Βοῦνι πάνδικον for the corrupt βουνίτι ἔνδικον seems a good correction, though we are not sure that the hiatus is an objection to Dindorf's reading.

V. 761. Haupt's αἰστος looks plausible, and would be something more if the remainder of the old text ἀμπετήσαις δόσως could be settled with any sort of certainty. It can hardly be doubted that some part of ἀναπέτομαι is the word required, both by the sense and by the traces of the MSS.; but neither Mr. Paley's ἀμπετεῖσ' (an unknown aorist), nor his ἀμπετήs (a word which, as he sees himself, could only come from πίπτω) can be said to supply the want. Whether αἰστος or αἰστος be the reading must depend on the antistrophe, where there is a similar choice between χριμφθῆναι and χριμφθῆν, a correction of Dindorf's.

V. 764. We cannot believe that Æschylus meant to say, 'My heart can no longer abide without flying,' especially as he goes on immediately to speak of the heart as undergoing a different process. Much more probable is Bothe's πέλοιτο κῆρ (after Schutz's πέλοι γε), the corruption of which would be accounted for by supposing κῆρ to have been blundered into κέαρ by a transcriber who took it for κῆρ, leaving the change into πέλοι to

follow as a matter of course. In that case it would be better to alter ἄφυκτον into ἄφυκτος.

V. 766. Mr. Paley had a note on πατὴρ σκοπαί, which he now omits, as though it were no longer wanted. Yet the words are not easy. His conclusion, that the Scholiast is right in paraphrasing προσκοπήσας ὁ πατήρ καὶ σημάνας ἐτάραξεν, seems on the whole the safest, as there is nothing unnatural in making the chorus charge their ruin on the discoverer of the danger. σκοπαί, however, might stand for the thing seen—the ship to wit—which would bear the blame with more justice.

V. 770. Whether χριμθῇν or χριμφθῇναι be right, we gladly accept χροῖ for χεροῖν from Dindorf and Boissonade.

V. 774. We question whether Porson's transposition of χιῶν and νέφη can be accepted as a restoration. It is something undoubtedly to have got rid of δὲ, which seems impracticable; but πρὸς δὲ still remains to cause a difficulty. Turnèbe's δι' ὕδρηλὰ would be better, 'on which the snow falls through the watery clouds,' if the metrical objection could be removed, as it might by reading δι' ὕγρὰ, a conjecture which we fancy we have seen elsewhere. But it is impossible to speak with any confidence.

V. 777. Μακιστήρα καρδίας, in v. 460, seems to show that δαίκτηρος καρδίας are to be taken together here.

V. 786. This line and the next seem to have been tampered with beyond the possibility of conjectural remedy. Without attempting a complete restoration, therefore, we will just suggest that ἀμφ' αὐτὰς may have been originally φηγὰς, and τέμνω the Homeric τέμνω, which occurs in the conjunctive Od. xv. 15.

V. 789. The antistrophic v. 797 shows that we ought to transpose the present line into θεοῖσι μέλη λίτανα καί. Mr. Paley saw this in his first edition, though he unaccountably wished to omit the last word: now he wishes to read καὶ λιτάνευε θεοῖς, a proposal which deviates widely from the text, without, as far as we can see, restoring the metre. Of the next words we confess we can make nothing. It is singular that they bear at least a verbal resemblance to another perplexed line, (v. 115), θεοῖς δ' ἐναγέα τέλεα, πελομένων καλῶς: but the parallel has not helped us either to an explanation or an emendation.

V. 791. Both Schutz's λύσιμα γάμον and Mr. Paley's λύσιμα μάχην seem good, though they proceed on irreconcilable hypotheses; the one connecting λύσιμα with what follows, the other with what goes before. If the former be the true view of the context, we might read λυσίμαχά μοι δ' ἔπιδε, 'look to a way of ending strife,' μοι being preserved partly in the termination μάχιμα, partly in its own shape, twice over in the previous line. The chief obstacle is in the quantity of the first syllable, but the

instances of *λυσιπαίγμων* and *λυσινήμων* seem to show that it may occasionally be shortened, apparently as being derived from *λύσις*. *Λύσιμα* itself is to all appearance in a similar predicament; analogy pleads for lengthening the vowel, though there seems to be no very direct authority for the poetical use of the word; but the metre proves that it must be short. The reception of *μὴ φίλοις* (Lachmann) in the next verse, is an act of tardy justice on Mr. Paley's part: he had formerly kept the old reading, *φιλεῖς*, which he wished to connect with *ὄρων* = *ὄραν*. Perhaps, however, *μὴ φίλως* would be a still further improvement.

V. 804—887. After all that Mr. Paley and Dr. Donaldson (New Cratylus, ed. 2. § 475) have done for this scene, it continues to justify the sentence passed by Dindorf, 'Hæc pars fabulæ tam male habita est ut de vitiis plerisque ne conjecturæ quidem probabilis locus sit.' We rather shrink from meddling with it, as we have scarcely anything to offer ourselves, even in the way of guesswork: but it may be worth while just to see how much or how little has been effected, or may be effected, by criticism.

V. 804. We see no reason why Mr. Paley should have given these singular exclamations to the Herald rather than to the Chorus, to whose expressions of terror they form a natural introduction: nor why he and all other editors should have printed them without the breathings to which they are entitled as initial vowels. As to the rest of this speech, with the exception of *καββὰς* for *κάκκας*, nothing satisfactory, or even plausible, has been suggested. We observe that Dindorf, in his new edition, prints the first part as follows, *ὅδε μάρπτis | νάιος | γάιος | τῶν πρὸ μάρπτi κάμνοis | ἰὸφ ὅμ | αὐθι κάκκας | vv.* If, as we suppose, this division of the lines is taken from the Med. MS. the natural conclusion would be that the passage is mutilated rather than corrupt.

V. 817. The authority of the Scholiast is scarcely a sufficient warrant for Mr. Paley's transference of these lines to the Herald. *Οὐκοῦν* cannot be called an exact equivalent of *εἰ δὲ μὴ*, and a speech from the Chorus appears to be what is wanted, though the enumeration of tortures suits the Herald, perhaps, rather better.

V. 821. We are by no means sure that it is necessary to adopt *ἀμαλα*. The Etymologicum Magnum may be right in preserving *ἀμάδα*, which is nearer to the *ἀμίδα* of the MSS.; and Hesychius' gloss, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀμᾶν τὴν ἄλα*, may mean no more than that he derived *ἀμὰς* from *ἀμᾶν*. As will be seen, in the absence of evidence, we follow Hermann in assuming the penult to be long. Dobree's *ἀλλαδα*, which Donaldson adopts, may, however, be worth consideration.

V. 822. From this line the correspondence of strophe and antistrophe begins to be traceable. Vv. 822—825, 833—836

clearly answer to each other, if we adopt, as no one now will hesitate to do, Hermann's διώλον for δι' ὅλον in v. 825—and thus the metrical relation of the remaining lines is a matter of inference. Both metre and language, however, are in themselves doubtful to the last degree. Mr. Paley, following Dr. Donaldson, has been able to effect an arrangement which in some measure satisfies both, but it bears too much the mark of being *pro re natâ*, at the same time that it involves considerable departure from the corrupt MSS. text. In the attempt which we subjoin, the changes introduced are still more violent: but the result, utterly unauthorized as we confess it to be, seems to us more like what Æschylus might have written. As such, and as such alone, we venture to put it forward.

στροφή.
ΚΗ. αἴμονα σ' ἐπ' ἀμάδα θήσω 826
τρόπον δραπετά.
κελεύω βίᾳ μεθέσθαι
ἴχαρ ~~~~~
φρενῖτιν ἰὼν ἰὼν.
λεῖψ' εἶδραν, κί' ἐπὶ δόρν'
ἂ τίετ' ἂμ πόλιν οὐ σέβω.

ἀντιστροφή.
ΚΗ. ἄγρια σ' ἄγω βαθυχαίταν 837
εἰθείρας χερσίν.
σὺ δ' ἐν ναὶ ναὶ βάσει
τάχα θέλεος ἀθέλεος
βίᾳ βοᾷ τε πολλῇ.
βᾶθι μὴ προκακοπαθεῖν
ὀλομένα παλάμαις ἑμαῖς.

In v. 832 we have adopted Mr. Paley and Prof. Scholefield's reading: in v. 843, Dr. Donaldson's. The other alterations are our own—most of them, as we are aware, far overpassing the ordinary limits of conjecture, and at best entitled merely to a provisional existence, till something as plausible, and nearer to the original, has been struck out. The main advantage of the proposal, as it seems to us, is that it affords a tolerably natural escape from the cardinal difficulty of the common text, which puts strophe and antistrophe into the mouths of different speakers. With μεθέσθαι ἰὼν, compare Eum. 782, ἰὼν ἀντιπενθῇ μεθεῖσα: with φρενῖτιν ἰὼν, Ag. 834, δύσφρων γὰρ ἰὼς καρδίαν προσήμενος: with ἄγω σε εἰθείρας, below v. 882, ἔλξειν ἀποσπάσας κόμης, and Eur. Iph. Aul. 1365, ἄξει δ' οὐχ ἐκούσαν ἀρπάσας; δηλαδὴ ξανθῆς εἰθείρης.

V. 836. It is surprising that the editors, some of whom have found a difficulty in this line (Bamberger suggesting οἶδμα for αἶμα, as Pearson had suggested νᾶμα), should not have seen that βροτοῖσι is an error for βοτοῖσι, and that the clause ἐνθεν—θάλλει is an exact explanation of the epithet ἀλφεσίβοιον, which Mr. Paley rightly renders 'quod boves nutrit ac pinguefacit.'

V. 848. Both of Mr. Paley's emendations, πολὺν φαρμῶν and εὐρείαισιν appear certain. The former was obvious enough: but the latter is a real instance of critical success. The reading of the Med. MS., εὐρυχωρίας, is easily accounted for by supposing the transcriber's eye to have wandered to the word χῶμα in the previous line.

V. 852. *Χέων νόμον*, or *νόμον χέων*, is likely enough. Like Mr. Paley, however, we hesitate a little at the gender, thinking with him that Danaus is plainly off the stage. There seems nothing for it but an *Enallage numeri*: but the uncertainty of the rest of the line makes this doubtful.

V. 854. Mr. Paley's reading, *ἄγρια γὰρ σὺ λάσκεις*, was originally proposed by Dr. Donaldson in a note on his edition of the *Antigone*, though he now prefers to read *ἄβροτα*. To us it seems more probable that the original text should have been *λυμαντῆς ὑπὸ γὰς ὑλάσκει*, or something of the sort, the allusion being to the barking of Cerberus. Compare v. 871 below, where there is a similar mention of the Herald in the third person instead of a direct address. We have nothing to propose for *περιχαμπτά*, though we do not believe in *περιχυμπτά* any more than Mr. Paley. In the next line he has made a correction which we are happy to speak of as beyond doubt—*ὃ σε θρέψας* for *ὃς ἐρωτᾷς*—thus restoring the very words which the sense would have led us most to expect, at the expense of a change which those acquainted with palæography will acknowledge to be more than probable.

V. 861. Both strophe and antistrophe appear to us hopeless. If we were required to bring them into correspondence, we should be disposed to assume that the original antitype of v. 862 was *μαιμᾷ πέλας δίπους ὄφης*, the words *οἰοὶ πάτερ* having been accidentally omitted in the antistrophe. But we find it impossible to arrive even at a proximate conclusion as to the true reading. Here, as in v. 791 above, we take *πάτερ* to be an address to Zeus, not to Danaus. Consequently it seems likely that *βρότεος* or *βρότειος*, rather than *βρέτεος*, should be the reading in the following line, in spite of the Scholiast. Compare v. 96, *ιδέσθω δ' εἰς ὕβριν βρότειον*. Looking to the context, however, we think that it is not the outrageousness of human violence, but the tardiness of human aid which Zeus is here bidden to regard, as the comparison of the spider is not the most suitable one that could have been chosen for a ravisher, though Mr. Blackie appears to think otherwise. This may reconcile us to Eustathius as a voucher for *ἄρος* in the sense of *ὄφελος*, unless it should be thought that *ἄρκος*, which has the authority of Alcæus, is more probable. Further we cannot pretend to go. As to the antistrophe, we have merely to remind Mr. Paley that *ἔχιδνα δ' ὥς μέ τις* (?) seems purposely meant to balance *ἄραχνος ὥς βάδην*, and also that he cannot be said to have restored the metre, when he has given no better equivalent for *ὄναρ ὄναρ μέλαν* than *πόδ' ἐνδακούσ' ἄγει* (qu. *ἔχει*).

V. 895. We have little doubt about accepting Porson's *ἄγω*, with a note of interrogation after *πῶς δ' οὐχί*; but see no reason

for altering *ἀπολωλόθ'*. 'That which was lost' here, as in the passage in S. Luke, sufficiently implies a relation to the person seeking or finding.

V. 896. It may be a question whether we should not read *ποίοις ἀνειπῶν* here, and *θεοῖς ἀνειπῶν*, v. 898, *ἀνειπεῖν* being a word especially used of heralds. *Θεοὺς ἀνειπῶν* has also been conjectured by Burges.

V. 897. See on v. 153.

V. 901. Though we do not approve of Mr. Paley's ellipse, which makes this line the completion of v. 895, we agree with him that the context fixes the sense of *ἀγοιμ' ἄν* as against Wellauer.

Vv. 905, 906. Mr. Paley's silence, we conclude, is meant to show that he adheres to the view of his former edition, understanding *ἀβουκόλητον*, κ.τ.λ. 'that is not a thing I heed.' In that case we do not see how he could avoid reading with Heath *λέγοιμ' ἄν*. Wellauer, in defending the one, points out the only possible way of regarding the other: 'Præco, se cum rege loqui ignorans, jubet eum ipsum hæc convicia ad Ægyptios perferre: deinde quum rex hoc personæ suæ convenire negasset, quærit præco, quis sit.' *Ἀβουκόλητον* then would mean 'I have other cattle to look after,' and *φρόνημα* would bear the sense which it does in Prom. 953.

V. 907. The later Editors have plainly been right in restoring *εἰδώς* here and *τοῦνομ' ἐν χρόνῳ*, v. 915. There can be little question, too, about the truth of Bothe's or Burges' *εἴσει σὺ τ' αὐτός*.

V. 927. Mr. Paley's *τάδ' ἐστὶν ἤδη* is surely very improbable. To those who are not satisfied with the choice of readings already before them, we beg to offer a new one, *ἔστω* (or *ἔσται*) *τάδ' ἡ δέῃ πόλεμον αἰρήσει νέον*.

V. 936. 'Eὐθυμῆν ἐστὶν libri, et mox ἐντυχούση. Depravatus videtur versus extra spem emendandi.' (Paley.) We read *εἰ θυμός ἐστιν*, 'if you have a mind,' either connecting the clause with the two lines preceding, or, if the full stop at the end of v. 935 be retained, supposing the usual ellipse of *καλῶς ἔχει*. (In this conjecture we find from Wellauer that we have been anticipated by Bothe, who, as usual, silently withdraws it in his second edition). For the rest, we decidedly prefer Porson's *εὐτύκους*, as Mr. Paley once did.

V. 939. We cannot encourage Mr. Paley's hope (as originally expressed) that he has been the first to point this passage rightly. On the contrary, it seems to us clear that *τὰ λῶστα* and *τὰ θυμηδέστατα* go together, so that *πάρεστι* must be taken, as it well may be, parenthetically.

Vv. 952—956. More than one of the editors have noted it as strange that the king should address the servants. We wonder

that no one has seen that these lines belong to the Chorus, from whom alone the words *φίλοι δμῳίδες* would naturally come. Having spoken of the dangers of evil report (v. 949), they proceed to caution their attendants.

V. 961. 'Πικρῶς recte vertit Scholef. *cum indignatione*.' (Paley.) In that case we should rather have expected τὰ πραχθέντα πρὸς τῶν ἐκτενῶν φίλων, κ. τ. λ., as it would not be the precautions but the sufferings of Danaus that would excite indignation. The phrase it is true is used generally, but always, so far as we see, with some reference to action. We are not sure, however, whether it would be worth while on this account to connect πικρῶς with τοὺς ἐκτενεῖς φίλους, so as to produce the same antithesis as in Cho. 234. τοὺς φιλτάτους γὰρ οἶδα νῶν ὄντας πικρούς. Some perhaps may be tempted to proceed further, and substitute πικρούς for πικρῶς here.

V. 966. Mr. Paley is quite right in complaining of the impracticability of this and the following line, to which the later editors have not paid sufficient attention. The change which he proposes, τυγχάνοντα πρηνεμῇ for τυγχάνοντας εὐπρηνῇ, and χρέων for ἐμοῦ, would be satisfactory enough, if it were not so violent. We should prefer to read τυγχάνοντας, ἐν πρύμνῃ . . . νόμος. With regard to ἐν πρύμνῃ, we find we have been anticipated by Mr. Paley himself in his first edition, though he does not appear to appreciate the force which we would give to the word, 'in the bottom' (or in the language of the Psalms, 'ground') 'of the heart'; πρύμνη = πρέμνη, as πρύμνοθεν appears = πρέμνοθεν. With τυγχάνοντας—σέβεσθαι νόμος compare Cho. 150. ὑμᾶς δὲ κωκυτοῖς ἐπανθίζειν νόμος. Or, if we adopt σέβεσθε, a reading which, considering the variations of the MSS. in other places, is quite as probable, we might obtain the same result by reading νόμῳ or νέμειν, understanding σέβεσθε νέμειν not like σέβομαι προσιδέσθαι in Pers. v. 694, but in the sense which the verb bears with a common accusative. In that case, however, it will of course be necessary to read τυγχάνοντος with Stanley.

V. 976. Mr. Paley does not mention Linwood's (or rather Bothe's) τί μὴν; the truth of which, we think, cannot be gained, as it is really only a restoration of the reading of the Med. MS. Adopting it, we shall have to look for an accusative for κηραίνουσι; and this, as it seems to us, may be gained without difficulty by removing the full stop at the end of v. 977, and reading, in v. 978, καρπώματα στάζονθ', ἃ κηρύσσει Κίπρις. If we are right thus far, we may conjecture further that κωλύνουσιν, in v. 979, has been substituted for some verb which was coupled with κηραίνουσι, describing the ravages committed on the unripe fruit, and so that κάλῳρα should be changed, as

Stanley changed it, into *κάωρα*. But the whole line is hopeless in the last degree, so as to leave no room for isolated guesses. We are sorry to add that we do not see the slightest probability in Mr. Paley's emendation, in spite of the confidence which has led him, after the lapse of seven years, to retain it in the text.

V. 998. From Dindorf's account it appears that the reading of the Aldine Ed. is not as Wellauer supposed, *οἷς χῶμ'*, but *οἷχῶμ'*, and that it cannot be adduced in favour of the change of *οἷ* into *οἷς*. That change, however, is so slight that it may stand on its own merits, especially when taken in connexion with *περιναίεται*, the most natural and obvious correction of the corrupt *περιναίετε*, unless we prefer *περιναίετᾶ*, *sensu neutro*, which might be better, as *περιναίειν* does not seem to occur elsewhere. This seems to us better than adopting, as Mr. Paley now does, the doubtful middle form, *περιναίονται*, from Hermann, for the sake of producing exact conformity with so unusual a variety of the genus Ionic a Minore as v. 1009.

V. 1008. *πολύτεκνοι* seems used as an epithet of *ποταμοί*, like *ἄτεκνος* of *λιχὴν*. Eum. 785. Otherwise we might read *πολυτέκνου*.

V. 1025. We prefer *ψεδυροί* to *ψίθυροι*, both as the less common word, and as seemingly better supported by the MSS. The two forms seem to bear the same relation to each other as *ψυθής* and *ψευδής*.

V. 1026. Haupt's *ἐπιπλοίας* we think, with Mr. Paley, the best correction proposed for *ἐπιπνοίαι*. *Τί ποτ'*, just below, seems genuine. The sense is, as we take it, not 'Why have they had fair gales if not to capture me?' but 'Why should fair gales wait on pursuers?' a reproach which the semichorus meets by counselling resignation. This will agree well enough with the common view, which makes the nominative to *ἔπραξαν* the enemy; and *διωγμοῖς* the dativus instrumenti: but it will be more clearly brought out if we understand *ἔπραξαν* of the gods *granting* a favourable voyage, and *διωγμοῖς* as a dativus commodi. Cf. Ag. 150. *ἀπλοίας τεύξῃ*.

V. 1035. We cannot accept Mr. Paley's explanation of this very difficult passage, *οὗτος ὁ γάμος ἀποβαίη ὥς πολλοὶ γάμοι ἀπέβησαν προτέραις γυναιξί*. The use of *γάμων τελευτὰ* is surely fixed by Ag. 745, as well as by the common use of *τέλος*, to be the *consummation* of marriage, not an *escape* from it. *Μετὰ πολλῶν*, we suspect, ought to go with *γυναικῶν*, not with *γάμων*. The sense then will be, 'May wedlock come to many women before me.' Or we may take *πέλοι* as equivalent to *πέλοι ἂν*, and understand the words as a reassurance, 'Fate must have its way—but marriage may be destined for many sooner than for us.' We do not see why *προτερῶν* should not stand in

this sense, though *πρότερα* or *πρότερον* would be more natural. Again, we might read *πέλει* with Bothe, so as to get a third interpretation, 'it is no more than many women have done before.' The 'Hμ. β'. we may remark, is rather disposed to discourage than to assent to extravagant petitions. In any case we would restore the Doric *πολλᾶν* for *πολλῶν*. As Mr. Paley remarks on *προτερᾶν*, 'raro in libris vel vestigium Dorici genitivi hodie reperitur.'

Vv. 1037—1046. Dindorf seems right in dividing this passage into strophe and antistrophe instead of, with Mr. Paley, making it an epode. There is a natural division at the end of v. 1041, so that the only thing wanted is to apportion the whole fairly between 'Hμ. α'. and β'. His arrangement, however, is objectionable, as putting vv. 1044, 1045, into the mouth of the same speaker, whereas it is clear that *μέτριον νῦν ἔπος εὐχου* is answered by *τίνα καιρόν με διδάσκεις*; to which *τὰ θεῶν μηδὲν ἀγάζειν* is the final rejoinder. We should propose a somewhat different scheme, giving vv. 1037-9 to 'Hμ. α'. v. 1040 to 'Hμ. β'. v. 1041 to 'Hμ. α'. then in the antistrophe reversing the order, so that 'Hμ. β'. would have vv. 1042-4, 'Hμ. α'. 1045, and 'Hμ. β'. v. 1046. This would preserve the difference of tone apparently intended in the speeches of the two Choral divisions, the one passionate and querulous, the other resigned and hortatory—a distinction seemingly perceived by Dindorf, but totally overlooked by Mr. Paley, whose plan has the further disadvantage of making 'Hμ. α'. both the first and the last speaker, so that 'Hμ. β'. has to go on with vv. 1047-1052, and 'Hμ. α'. to finish the play. *Τὸ μὲν ἂν βέλτατον εἴη* would then be added as a kind of taunt, in answer to the counsels of resignation previously given in v. 1031, 'May Zeus deliver us from this marriage! That is the best and only thing for us.' In v. 1040 we agree with Mr. Paley in understanding *ἄθελκτον* not of Zeus, but of the subject of their prayer. Compare Cho. 420. *πάρεστι σαίνειν, τὰ δ' (τὰ ἄχρα) οὔτι θέλγεται*. *Μέλλω*, in v. 1042, seems to have a reference to *τὸ μέλλον* in v. 1041, 'My future is not to pry into Zeus' unfathomable purposes.' *Ἀγάζειν*, in v. 1046, is well explained by Mr. Paley in a note, to which our Oxford lexicographers would do well to refer.

V. 1052. *εὐμενεί βία κτίσας* seems to admit of no plausible explanation as it stands. The words themselves are good and *Æschylean*, but yield no sense in the present connexion, as *κτίζω* appears hardly to be used with a single accusative of the person, unaccompanied by anything to express the action of the verb, except in the sense of *producing* or *begetting*, as in v. 171 above. If we could supply a word, such as *ἐμφορῶν* or *ἐγκνον*, either of which would express the influence of Zeus on Io, all would be

right, but there is nothing in the context to help us to it, either directly or indirectly, by suggesting a possible corruption: so we must suppose either that *κρίσας* may have a peculiar sense of which we know nothing, or that the reading of the line is wrong. *Εὐμενῇ βίον κρίσας* would not be a violent alteration, and might be defended in point of expression from Cho. 350. *ἐπιστρεπτόν αἰῶ κρίσας*, but we do not like to part with *βία*, though involving a different view of Zeus' operations from that given in our remarks on v. 570.

V. 1053. We see nothing better for *τὸ βέλτερον κακοῦ καὶ τὸ δίμοιρον αἰῶν* than Mr. Paley's explanation, 'I submit to a chequered lot.' For *ἔπεσθαι* we would propose *ἐπέσται*, keeping *δίκαι* *δίκας*, the latter as the gen. singular. 'Justice shall preside over our cause,' or, perhaps, 'our cause shall stand on justice.'

We had hoped to say something more general about the play: but our limits warn us that we must conclude. What our readers will think of the extent to which we have entered into critical detail we know not: we only hope that some will be found to agree with us that it is worth while occasionally to examine with care and patience an edition of a classical work, especially one which, even after the second thoughts of one of the best scholars of the day, still leaves so much to be gleaned by a reviewer as the *Supplices* of Æschylus.

ART. VI.—*The Law relating to the Convocations of the Clergy : with Forms of Proceedings in the Provinces of Canterbury and York, &c.* By ROBERT R. PEARCE, ESQ. of Gray's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London : S. Sweet. 1848.

NOTHING is further from our purpose than to enter into anything like a discussion of the momentous subject of the future Synodical action of the Church of England. It is a matter which will settle itself. It shapes itself as it grows. It is assuming an orderly and formal guise the more surely, because the more indirectly. All that we are at present concerned with is the immediate step. It is best to confine ourselves to the next and indispensable move. We are not called upon to forecast, or to be prepared with, a great and perfect future for the Church's legislation. Constitutions are capable of paper symmetry and completeness : but somehow one of these literary forms of government never advances beyond its literary perfection. We want no ecclesiastical Siéyes nor Bentham : when Convocation gets to work it will reform itself without doubt. Let the first step be to get it into action. For ourselves, we may own, are no great admirers of its present constitution. There are traces in it, unquestionably, of large, important principles ; but there are also evident signs of those principles being overlaid and deteriorated. In some particulars they are inapplicable to the present state of the Church : in others, to an advanced stage of intellectual culture. Convocation being no longer an assembly, one of whose chief functions, if not its chief function, was to tax the Clergy, there seems no reason for restricting the ecclesiastical franchise to the beneficed Clergy. Again, since much of its future business must be concerned with doctrine, some provision ought to be made for the theological faculty of the Universities being represented in it. Since, moreover, the Capitular Clergy are not at present in that supreme advance, moral or intellectual, of the parochial Clergy which they once laid claim to, the disproportion between the proctors for the Cathedral Chapters and the parochial proctors might reasonably be abolished. Neither have we any very decided feelings as to the desirableness of retaining two provincial Synods. Again : the various and discordant customs which prevail in the different dioceses, and under which the parochial proctors are elected, might well be simplified and reduced to uniformity. We specify these matters, not because any of them at present are of paramount importance, but merely to show that our unceremonious dismissal of such subjects on the present occa-

sion is not to be attributed to any lack of interest in the future constitution of Convocation. Nay, the very interest of such questions may, at this juncture, draw men's minds from that which is their first concern. We have a pressing and engaging work : let all be kept subordinate to it. Before our next number reaches our readers, the Proctors in the new Convocation may have been elected. At present let us pay some attention to the elections.

A new Convocation is, at the present moment, a very important matter. No one knows what may come of it. The stirring of the dry bones of the past, which has already taken place, cannot come to nothing. We by no means say that the future of the Church of England depends on the next Convocation. Very far from it : but it is not so improbable that some matter may come before it in which it is desirable that the Church should be fairly represented. Naturally and in the order of events, the next stage in the agitation and movement for recovering Synodical action is the next election of Proctors. To this it is well that the immediate efforts of Churchmen should be concentrated. To get the right candidates—Proctors who will attend at every prorogation, will watch every opening for business, who will work in the temper of those who built the wall of Jerusalem, will spare neither expense nor trouble in the cause—is not easy, but most necessary. When the last Proctors were appointed—or appointed themselves—in the old lazy humdrum way, who could have foreseen what was reserved for them? If the next Parliament, or next Convocation, should survive its normal period of five or six years, can it be reasonably predicted that nothing will depend on the parochial Proctors? They exist, to be sure, but as a small numerical component of even the Lower House : but their position, the interests which they represent, and their cohesion, make them the most important section in it. If the elective Proctors do their duty, they will always be enabled at the very least to prevent mischief in Convocation. Were our advice asked, we should urge considerable care in the selection of candidates. Church Unions might profitably take up the details of the next election. Much carelessness, perhaps positive irregularity with respect to the citations to the incumbents to elect, may be prevented. The local customs may be profitably watched. Search into the Diocesan Registers with respect to the existence of customs might be prosecuted, as, for instance, whether Archdeaconries elect conjointly or separately, and, if any, in whom and by what prescription exists the power of reducing the Proctors elected by the several Archdeaconries to two, to represent the whole Diocese. This point we think important, for it is by no means improbable, that, as in our parliamentary history there was a time in which it was considered a burthen to represent a county

or borough, so this reduction of the parochial Proctors might have been originally intended as a relief. Now, however, that a seat in Convocation, like a seat in the House of Commons, has its value, it would be very important to ascertain how the election by an Archdeaconry of 'two sufficient Procurators' is, without process, set aside. In a word, we think that those interested in the revival of Synodical action, whether by Convocation or by Synods, diocesan or provincial, would do well to turn their thoughts, perhaps exclusively, to the next election of Proctors. The duty which is nearest is dearest.

In a question growing on the mind of the Church, as that of Synodical action is, it is, to say the least, not likely that the next meeting of Convocation will be less important or interesting than the last. And very important that meeting was. It was the first occasion since the collapse of Convocation in Hoadley's case that business has been actually transacted. Gradually the Proctors have been occupying this point: session by session they have crept on: post by post has been won from official irresolution and apathy. The 'cold obstruction' of the Upper House has at length been kindled: perplexed and baffled, beaten back from subterfuge to subterfuge, even Sir John Dodson was at length carried away. Silenced but not convinced, the Queen's Advocate was compelled to remain a reluctant witness of the ecclesiastical fact of the year, the event which will give the expiring Convocation a name in History, an actual Debate in Convocation. We have been at some pains to acquire an exact account of what occurred at the last Session of Convocation. Its contingent, as well as actual, importance, requires that it should receive at least as permanent a record as our own pages can give: and the readers of the *Christian Remembrancer* may depend on its authenticity.

No notice had been given of the intention of the Archbishop of Canterbury to hold a meeting of Convocation on the 3d February. But as much interest was felt among the Clergy, in consequence of what had passed last year, when a petition was received by his Grace and the Upper House, inquiry was made as to the day and time, and Wednesday, the 3d February, at twelve o'clock, having been found to be the time appointed;—

The Bishops of London, Winchester, Exeter, Chichester, Oxford, Lichfield, S. Asaph attended at twelve o'clock. The Archbishop had appointed a Meeting of all the Bishops at the Bounty Board at half-past twelve o'clock, in order to consider the provisions of a new Clergy Offences Bill—and the suggestions of certain Clergymen respecting the separation of the Offices in Divine Service.

Petitions were presented¹ from nineteen of the twenty-one Dioceses of

¹ In the Upper House the Bishop of London presented petitions from the Dioceses of London, Winchester, Ely, Gloucester and Bristol, and Worcester, praying the Convocation to take such steps as should appear to them most effectual to procure from the Crown the necessary licence for the performance

the Province of Canterbury, praying the House to address a Petition to her Majesty to sanction the meeting of Convocation for real synodal action. It could not be said that the matter came by surprise on the Archbishop; for a Petition had been entrusted to his Grace to present to the House— which Petition he had requested some other Bishop to present.

In presenting the Petitions entrusted to himself, the Bishop of Oxford declared his intention of moving that the House consider the prayer of the Petitions. Upon this, the Queen's Advocate (Sir J. Dodson) interposed, saying, that he felt it his duty, as legal adviser of the Archbishop, to declare that such a proceeding was without precedent; that for 135 years the Crown had called Convocation to meet merely as a form, and had not permitted it to perform any business, citing the statute of 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, as forbidding Convocation to do any business whatsoever, without the express permission of the Crown.

Upon this, the Bishop of Exeter said, that, though he had not lately looked into that statute, yet his recollection of its import was clear, that the learned Queen's Advocate had ascribed to it inadvertently much larger words than it really contained. He had cited the word *business*, as used by the statute; whereas his (the Bishop's) recollection was clear, (speaking with due deference in contradiction to so high a legal authority,) that the prohibition in the 25 Hen. VIII. was not against Convocation doing any business whatever without the Royal Licence, but against making Canons, or conferring together for the making of Canons, when assembled under such Licence. [The Queen's Advocate assented.] The Bishop recognised the right of the Archbishop to prorogue the Convocation at pleasure—to stop him, if he thought fit, while he was speaking. But as to the fitness of his Grace's being advised to do so, on the ground of no precedent having occurred of Convocations doing more than meeting and bowing, and being dismissed, during nearly a century and a half, he must be permitted to express his astonishment at such a reason being given for such advice. Why, the disuse of all action on the part of Convocation, for so long a period, was the very matter of complaint—the grievance which was to be remedied: to make the existence of that very grievance to be a reason for its continuance, was nothing short of mockery. In conclusion, he said, that he must be a bold man, who would advise the Archbishop (contrary to his Grace's own nature and disposition) to reject on such a ground the prayer of the Clergy of almost every Diocese in the Province. If precedent

of their constitutional functions. The Bishop of Exeter presented similar petitions from the Dioceses of Exeter, Hereford, Bangor, Llandaff, and Peterborough. The Bishop of Chichester presented petitions to the same effect from the Dioceses of Chichester, Bath and Wells, Lincoln, and Rochester; a petition in which a wish was expressed for the admission of delegates from the communicant laity to the synodical assemblies of the Church; and a petition from the London Union on Church Matters, praying Convocation to address the Crown for licence to make Canons for the more effectual representation of the Church of England in Convocation or Synod; and until such licence be granted, to make public declaration of their want of confidence in any measures affecting the spiritualities of the Church, which may be prepared in Parliament without the previous counsel and concurrence of a Synodical assembly of the Church, and in particular in the proposed additional measure for the enforcement of discipline among the Clergy. The Bishop of Lichfield presented a petition from his own Diocese, praying the Convocation to address the Crown for licence to perform its constitutional functions. The Bishop of Oxford presented similar petitions from the Dioceses of Oxford, Norwich, Salisbury, and S. David's. The Bishop of S. Asaph presented a petition from his own Diocese. A petition from the Diocese of Canterbury was likewise presented at his Grace's request.

was to be cited, let them look to the precedent set by that Sovereign who died a martyr to his fidelity to the Church. His declaration, prefixed to the Articles, and reprinted as often as the Book of Common Prayer was printed, contained a solemn promise that the Sovereign would do, as often as Convocation should ask him to do, that which it was the prayer of all these Petitions that we should beseech her Majesty to do.

The Bishop of Oxford said, that the motion which he intended to make was not of the general nature which might be expected. There was notice of the intention to introduce a new Clergy Discipline Bill—a matter in which the Clergy at large were immediately interested, and on which they (the Bishops) all knew, that the greatest dissatisfaction was felt and expressed by the Clergy, that they were not consulted. He, therefore, deemed it his duty to move, that this House do present an humble Address to her Majesty, praying her Majesty to issue her Royal Licence for Convocation to meet and consult together respecting the fittest provisions to be introduced into the intended Bill.

The Bishops of London, Exeter, and Chichester expressed their warm assent to this motion; after which the Bishops of Winchester, Lichfield, and S. Asaph declared themselves against it. The Bishop of S. Asaph stated, seemingly as his main reason, that the Bishops present were but a small portion of the Episcopate of the Province—that their absent brethren ought to have an opportunity of expressing their judgment on the matter—that their absence could be well accounted for by the ordinary practice of the House meeting for no other purpose than to be prorogued—and, therefore, that no decision ought to be had, without due notice being given to all, in order that all might be enabled to form and declare a judgment on so grave a question.

The fairness of this suggestion was acknowledged by all; and the Bishop of Oxford, with the full concurrence of those Bishops who had supported his motion, pressed on his Grace the fitness of proroguing, for a definite, and not very remote period. He submitted that a month would be a sufficient time, for all to be informed, and to be prepared.

His Grace, declaring that he thought it most unfit that the Church should be placed in opposition to her Majesty's Government, announced his purpose to prorogue to the 19th of August next. Upon this, the Bishop of Oxford gave notice that on that day he should repeat the motion which he had this day made.

The Lower House was then sent for, in order to the prorogation. On their arrival, the Prolocutor, holding a paper in his hand, stated that he had to present an Address to the Upper House, which, with his Grace's permission, he would read. His Grace said, that they had been sent for, in order that the Convocation be prorogued. Sir John Dodson, the Queen's Advocate, declared that it was contrary to all precedent, that, under such circumstances, an Address from the Lower House should be received. The Bishop of Exeter saying, that he much doubted the accuracy of this statement, or at least its relevancy, the Lower House was desired to retire to their chamber, while this question was considered. After they had retired, the Bishop of Exeter, still doubting the accuracy of the Queen's Advocate's statement, said, that whether it was accurate, or not, he ventured to submit to his Grace's consideration, whether he would reject the Address of the other House by the exercise of a power, which did indeed undoubtedly belong to his high office.

His Grace declared his willingness to receive the Address. Accordingly the Lower House was recalled; their Address was read, received, and entered as part of the proceedings of the day. After which, his Grace declared the prorogation to the 19th of August next.

In the Lower House (present—the Dean of Canterbury, Prolocutor; the Archdeacons of Maidstone, Bath, Barnstaple, Bristol, Sarum, Taunton; and of the Proctors, the Rev. Drs. Mill, Spry, Coleridge, and Moore; the Rev. Messrs. Huntley, Mills, Lowther, Randolph, Woodgate, Gillett, Majendie, Yardley, Harding, and Goddard,) several petitions of a nature similar to those presented in the Upper House were presented.

A long and important Address to the Upper House of Convocation, setting forth many of the difficulties under which the Church labours, and praying that the two Houses might at once proceed to business, and especially urging the gravity of the occasion, and the mockery and unreality which the Convocation sanctioned by its practice of formal meeting for the mere purpose of adjournment, after the solemn prayers¹ which had been recited, was moved by Mr. Huntley and seconded by Dr. Mill. After considerable discussion on the various topics embraced in this Address, it was suggested by the Archdeacon of Maidstone, that as the House may be summoned for prorogation before so extensive an Address could be satisfactorily settled, it would be better to adopt a shorter Address; the Archdeacons of Barnstaple and Taunton strongly urging the insertion of that part of Mr. Huntley's address which related to the inconsistency between the solemn prayers offered, and a mere formal sitting. It was then urged that Mr. Huntley's Address should be referred to a Committee, consisting of Mr. Huntley, Dr. Spry, Mr. Randolph, and the Archdeacon of Maidstone, who should report upon it at the next meeting of the Convocation. Meanwhile the Archdeacon of Maidstone proposed a short form of address, which was seconded by Mr. Majendie, and, with an addition suggested by the Archdeacon of Bristol, adopted, to the following effect:—

'That this Lower House of Convocation has this day received numerous Petitions from many dioceses, praying for proper steps being taken to secure the revival of the synodical action of the Church; that this House sympathises with the prayer of these Petitions, and having especial reference to the solemn character of the prayers offered at the commencement of the session of Convocation, which character appears to be altogether inconsistent with the system of continual prorogation, begs to call the attention of the Upper House to the reasonableness of the prayer of the Petitions.'

The Prolocutor having taken charge of the Address, and being about to proceed with it to the Upper House, the Apparitor at the same moment appeared to summon the Lower House for the act of prorogation.

During the Debate in the Upper House on the propriety of receiving

¹ These prayers are the ordinary Litany, with the addition of the suffrage:—

'Ut presenti huic Convocationi Spiritu Tuo Sancto aspirare et preesse digneris, qui nos ducat in omnem veritatem, quæ est secundum pietatem; Te rogamus, audi nos, Domine.'

And of the prayer:—

'Domine Deus Pater Luminum et Fons omnis Sapientiæ; Nos ad scabellum pedum Tuorum provoluti, humiles tui et indigni famuli, Te rogamus, ut qui in nomine Tuo, sub auspiciis clementissimæ Reginæ Victoriæ hic convenimus, Gratiâ Tuâ coelitus adjuti, ea omnia investigare, meditari, tractare, et discernere valeamus, quæ honorem Tuum et gloriam promoveant et in Ecclesiæ cedant profectum. Concede igitur ut Spiritus Tuus, qui Concilio olim Apostolico, huic nostro etiam nunc inseat, ducatque nos in omnem veritatem, quæ est secundum pietatem; Ut qui ad amussim Sanctæ Reformationis nostræ, errores, corruptelas et superstitiones olim hic grassantes, Tyrannidemque Papalem, merito et serio repudiavimus, Fidem Apostolicam et vere Catholicam firmiter et constanter teneamus omnes, Tibique rite puro cultu intrepidè serviamus, per Jesum Christum Dominum et Servatorem nostrum.—Amen.'

the Address, the Committee for considering Mr. Huntley's Address was appointed, and ordered to report at the next meeting of Convocation. The proceedings occupied two hours.

Such was the last meeting of Convocation, of which the immediate result was the courteous conduct of the Bishop of London, who at once signified his purpose to abandon the Clergy Discipline Bill, against which the Clergy had in their petitions so strongly protested, until in some way the opinion of the Church could be formally taken upon it. Not only, then, has Convocation, for the first time for a hundred and thirty years, met—not only has it received petitions—not only has it debated—not only have the two Houses met in conference, but the principle is established that no measure deeply affecting the interests and sympathies of the Church will henceforth be submitted to Parliament without the formal intervention and consultation of some deliberative ecclesiastical body. The Bishops—ably and worthily so represented—have, in the person of the Bishop of London, declined for the future the onerous and ungenial work of legislating for all orders of the Church. This is the first success of the attempt to revive Convocation. A session so important as that which we have reported is not likely to be succeeded by a less interesting one. Are we then premature in urging attention to the composition of the next Convocation, which certainly must meet, *and must agree upon an Address to the Crown*, in the summer or autumn of the present year?

NOTICES.

UPON Sir George Stephen's 'Review of Mr. Barber's Case,' (Walford,)—and we own it to be a one-sided one—our sympathies are enlisted with Mr. Barber. The case—merely as one of the most remarkable of the *causes célèbres* of our own time—is especially interesting and dramatic; and while we frankly own that to pronounce a decided opinion on Mr. Barber's complicity requires a very technical and legal estimate of evidence, to which such as ourselves can lay no claim, still there are certain broad facts in this case which are open to the judgment of ordinary minds, and are of serious importance. Such as these: Mr. Barber is found guilty of a certain crime; sentenced, and transported for life accordingly. Subsequent facts come out; the case is further investigated; it seems very doubtful whether Mr. Barber is guilty; a conditional pardon is granted; the case is further sifted; and for some reason or other, as a fact, a full and free pardon is granted. Now this is one of those beautiful pieces of folly called a legal fiction. The law cannot acknowledge that it has done wrong; it cannot set aside its own hasty judgment; it cannot annihilate its proceedings. The verdict is still the verdict; the judgment, the judgment; the felon, the felon. So to get matters straight, the felon, who is *vi termini* no longer a felon, is pardoned for the crime which he has never committed. A pardon, if words have meaning, still assumes and implies the fact and existence of the crime, which, while it condones, it asseverates. But the case in question is one which, from its enunciation, is that of a man who has not committed at least the crime for which he was sentenced. Again, Sir George Stephen brings out as a fact, what, for the honour of human nature, we trust is untrue: Mr. Barber had been removed from Norfolk Island to Impression Bay; his pardon arrives, the prosecution having already utterly ruined him; when put on board the convict ship 'he was entirely destitute of clothing; hence, when on receiving his pardon he was ordered to divest himself of his prison dress, he remonstrated on the ground that he had no other . . . the superintendent compelled him to strip, as the best preparation for a walk of ninety miles to Hobart Town through the jungle . . . and it was only by the charity of the convicts themselves, who supplied him, one with a coat, another with trowsers, that he was not discharged in utter nudity, a passage by sea, even, being denied him,' (pp. 85, 86.) This exceeds all belief: a man who, whether innocent or not, is released from the penalty attaching to a charge which is now relinquished, is transported 20,000 miles, ruined, and left without a rag of his own; it is discovered that he ought not to have been transported, and then, by the tender mercies of our Christian authorities, who have done wrong, he is turned upon the world stark naked to find his way without a shirt or a sixpence ninety miles through the Australian bush. There must be mistake or exaggeration in this.

A really good abridgment of an expensive standard work cannot fail to be a benefit to the public. Mr. Clinton's 'Fasti Hellenici' has been too

long before the world to need any praise of ours: but its size and price have hitherto rendered it inaccessible to the great mass of ordinary classical students. This evil is now remedied by the author himself, in an 'Epitome of the Civil and Literary Chronology of Greece, from the Earliest Accounts to the Death of Augustus.' (Oxford: University Press.) The substance of those quartos is presented in a single compact octavo. 'In the present volume,' Mr. Clinton says, 'the quotations and references are omitted, the principal facts and observations are retained, and sometimes the arguments by which the facts are established.' There is also some additional matter, founded on evidence which has been collected since the last edition of the 'Fasti' was published. Not the least interesting feature in the book is a reply to Mr. Grote's chapter on the application of Chronology to Grecian Legend, going over nearly the same ground as Colonel Mure in his recent pamphlet. Without pretending to enter deeply into the controversy, we confess that our sympathy with Mr. Grote's view remains substantially unimpaired. Whether from indolence or from any better reason, we naturally listen to an author who tells us that all attempts to extract pure history from pure legend are a mere *labor ineptiarum*. Mr. Clinton warns us against thinking that the fables engrafted by the Epic poets on the tale of Troy cast a doubt on the reality of the event itself, and appeals to the Crusades as a parallel case. But we believe in the Crusades on the strength, not of contemporary fiction, but of contemporary history—rather an important difference. Nor does it seem to us conclusive to say that the Homeric poems, to be 'plausible fiction,' must have had a basis of truth. The argument merely proves that Homer did not invent the whole of his plot and characters, which Mr. Grote, we suppose, would grant, asserting that he took the substance of the legend as he found it. But whether Mr. Clinton be right or wrong in his view of the Heroic age of Greece, the usefulness of his book will be impeached by no one—least of all by Undergraduates reading for the Schools.

'The Vegetation of Europe,' by Mr. A. Henfrey, (Van Voorst,) is the first of a series of hand-books on the natural history of the European continent. It is a succinct but able and full account of the climatic distribution of plants. The general features of the physical geography are firmly and decisively touched: the mutual influences of geology and temperature, as dependent upon marine currents and the structural conformation of land, are elegantly shown; and we do not know where, in so small a compass, to find the results of the great generalization conducted by Humboldt and the scientific physicists of the age. The botany of a country is the most unerring key to its various physical characteristics. An ingenious and, for its size, a full isothermal map is prefixed.

Dr. Alison, the historian of Europe, has, in a new and enlarged 'Life of Marlborough,' (Blackwood,) collected all that is important in the great captain's perplexed and varied career. In the concluding chapter, where a parallel is drawn between him and the other military notables of modern times, the author rises above himself—his style, often languid, becomes pointed, and he evidently kindles with his theme. The care and elaboration displayed in the arrangement of materials is the same of which Dr. Alison

is so great a master: the politics—and, may we say, prejudice?—and the redeeming heartiness and good purpose, are the same as in the History of Europe.

An important little volume on 'Irish Ethnology,' by Mr. G. Ellis, (Hodges and Smith,) establishes a fact which politicians are reluctant to face. We feel that statesmen who will not grasp the great facts of national character, and of the tendencies and characteristics of race, labour very much in the dark. It was one of the faults of the Irish Union, that its purpose, in itself unexceptionable, of forming one national organization, had not sufficient plasticity to adapt itself to the strong marks which separate, and seem likely to separate, Celt and Saxon, in religion, industry, manners, and politics.

'A Manual of Hebrew Antiquities,' (Rivingtons,) appears to be close and systematic. It is one of a series, produced under the able superintendence of Mr. Kerchever Arnold. Mr. Browne, of Chichester, is the Editor, and has judiciously woven up much of the German information on the subject.

Mr. Watkins, of Brixworth, has resuscitated an old collection of verses, which he published some twenty years ago, on the 'Human Hand,' &c. (Pickering.) He has added some new pieces, chiefly celebrating the illustrious squirearchy of Northamptonshire, who, in considerable numbers, have come forward with their applause and shillings. We could willingly have let these effusions die. In case our Protectionist readers are curious to know how their leaders will live in immortal song, they may like to see Mr. Watkins' anticipation of the poetical as well as political fame which awaits them. In an 'Elegy on the sudden Death of Lord George Bentinck,' Mr. Watkins takes courage:—

'But let not gloom and sorrow long prevail—
With short and manly grief we best bewail.
Thine and our own great Leader, Stanley, lives;
Thy meet yoke-fellow, too, Disraeli, gives
His splendid eloquence to aid the cause
Of hearth and home, of liberty and laws;
And Rutland's sons, of true patrician race:—
And Richmond, staunch and firm in every place,' &c.—P. 105.

'Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus.' (Rivingtons.) The author, Mr. Bowen, Fellow of Brasenose, from his late official connexion with Corfu, and his intimate knowledge of the Romaic, has had peculiar means for acquiring information, which is very pleasantly imparted in this agreeable volume. A continual reference to classical association, happy quotations and allusion, make us respect Mr. Bowen's genial scholarship as much as we admire him as a companion in a tour.

'The Psalter, or Seven Hours of Prayer, according to the Use of the Church of Sarum,' (Masters,) is a remarkably beautiful book in its typography. It is sumptuously decorated, and illustrated with praiseworthy skill and diligence, and few, except those conversant with the old Office-Books, can understand what amount of pains and research and difficulty an editor must encounter in this thorny field of investigation. As an

antiquarian work, and as an important contribution to liturgical studies, we hail the appearance of this or similar works. They are most valuable in the illustration of our own Prayer-Book; and even on higher than archæological grounds we are bound to look with respect to the devotions of our fathers. We quite concur in the statement of the Editor—a most honourable and ingenuous person—that it is an acceptable present to Liturgists generally. But—and a very serious abatement of our cordial acceptance of the volume it is—the title-page and preface inform us that it is ‘for private and cœnobial use,’ of course among ourselves. This we can neither accept nor understand. The invitation and offence seem so entirely gratuitous. It is quite plain that there is a portion—and that no inconsiderable one—of the book which no member of the Church of England as now constituted can consistently use: the invocations to the saints, the doctrine of the merits and mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, for example. We do not say that the book ought to have been ‘adapted;’ but we do say distinctly that it ought not to have been recommended. The matter is to us totally inexplicable, because we have no reason to doubt the Editor’s entire loyalty to the Church of England. After saying this, it is perhaps superfluous to add that we should have been better pleased with an edition in the original Latin, with the present instructive mass of English illustration—at any rate, we should then have escaped the unsatisfactory version of the Psalms, which contrasts unfavourably, and even disloyally, with our noble Prayer-Book version. The version of the Hymns is occasionally very happy—occasionally rather the reverse—but, generally speaking, of a level character.

It is not without its significance that the next work on our list is the ‘Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, adapted for general use in other Protestant Churches.’ (Pickering.) Whether this is to be viewed as a specimen of downward tendencies among ourselves, or upward tendencies among those adherents of the Church of the Future who combine aesthetics with eclectics, painted glass, screens, and chants with a Socinian creed, and a very elaborate *Gesang-Buch* with a denial of the Catholic Faith, we hardly know. At any rate the present book—and many of the same sort have preceded it—shows what a vast amount of excision, alteration, and adaptation the Church of England requires to make it keep step with ‘other Protestant Churches.’ It *only* gets rid of the Creeds, and of the Ministry, and of the Sacraments; it only rejects Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, Absolution, the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Atonement, and of the grace given in the Sacraments. These at present, it is something to know, prevent our accordance—and the consideration is not without its force remembering certain recent rescripts from Lambeth—with ‘other Protestant Churches.’ It is needless to criticise a work of this purpose: but we cannot but notice one direct falsification. Pref. p. xii. ‘In the present Liturgy of 1662 the ‘term *‘Bishop* is introduced, when in the Liturgies of 1549 and 1552 *Minister* is ‘used in the Confirmation Service;’ which implies that in the first Reformed Books Confirmation—as in the present performance, and as in the kindred German practice—was administered by other than the Bishop. The fact being that certain suffrages and collects which are now assigned to the

Bishop were then to be used by the Priest, the act of confirmation being, of course, in all revisions of the office restricted to the Bishop.

'Gentle Influence,' (Masters,) is an extremely well-coloured tale. The characters are not new: nor the situation. But still it answers all purposes of a School-Reward Book; and we can recommend both its intention and execution.

We have received and read with great satisfaction the Bishop of Tasmania's 'Charge,' (Hobart Town: Best.) Its great value consists in the earnest and faithful reference which it makes to the disorganised state of the Colonial Church, as to the mutual relations between the Bishop and Clergy—a condition painfully illustrated by the details given in the Appendix. Bishop Nixon dwells forcibly on the desirableness of admitting a lay element, not only into the synodical, but also into the practical action of the Church. But with the minutes of the Australasian Synod before us—with firmness such as that for the most part displayed by the Bishops—with their general doctrinal soundness—with their integrity of purpose, we cannot, amid much to mourn over and much which is perplexing, but augur well for the future. The conduct of too many of the Missionary and Colonial Clergy, supported mainly by English liberality, is, however, becoming such a scandal as will soon attract serious attention on the part of those personally interested in contributing to the necessities of the Colonial Church.

The Bishop of Guiana's 'Charge,' (Rivingtons,) has also been published. The confiscation of the Clergy Reserves in Canada—the tampering with the incomes of the Demerara Clergy by the local legislature—the reluctance of the Australian congregations to provide for their teachers,—these facts—and such or similar occur in every Bishop's Charge which reaches us from the Colonies—convince us that the only way to make the Colonists value their privileges and their own stake in the Church, is to throw it entirely on its own resources and responsibilities.

The question just alluded to is approaching us. When we speak of the Colonial Church being left to its own resources, we have in view the little interest, or even the direct hostility, manifested by the colonial laity towards the Church and its principles. Thoughtful persons conceive that this difficulty—and it is obvious that it exists among ourselves—could be best met by developing the lay element and influence in the Church. To systematize and direct anomalous interference, it is thought the best means is to recognise a just and orderly lay cooperation. Mr. Gladstone, in an important 'Letter to the Bishop of Aberdeen,' (Murray,) has recommended this course—not without a plain reference to any changes which the existing condition of the English Convocation may require. He grounds his suggestions, not only on the principle of the thing and abstract justice, but on its unequivocal success in the Anglo-American Church, where it was introduced under the least promising auspices. That some such corrective must be introduced into any representative system of the Church is probable. The influence of the Crown upon the Church is weakened; Parliament, as now constituted, is properly reluctant to interfere with the spiritual concerns or self-management of a religious organization quite extraneous to itself. Still, while the Church remains in any, however faint, sense established, the

introduction of the lay element into Church Synods would serve as a check and counterbalance upon that factious interference with Church matters, which, though ineffective and discouraged in the House of Commons, still must be expected on the part of the Halls and Horsmans of the day; while at the same time it would serve, in the eyes of the public and of Parliament itself, to attract confidence to the proceedings and self-development of the Church. In a word, Parliament and the Crown might, in the development of the functions of laymen in Synods, accept a graceful occasion for abandoning much of those existing but ineffectual powers over the Church which they at present nominally retain. As the case stands, while Convocation or Synods are only struggling into new, or renewed, life, there are abundant counterbalances in the existing influences of the State on the exclusively clerical constitution of Convocation. When Synods assemble, and when Convocation reforms itself, the influence of the laity, now too often in a vexatious, and sometimes in a hostile, spirit manifested in the House of Commons, would be transferred to a more legitimate sphere in the Synod itself.

Such, or some such, considerations are a sufficient answer to 'Cautus,' who has addressed a 'Letter to Bishop Skinner,' (Lendrum,) on Mr. Gladstone's proposition. We must remind objectors of this class, that in some form or other, just as real though more indirect, a lay influence has always been brought to bear upon the Church, either directly, as in primitive times, or indirectly in the form of imperial laws, parliaments, a strong Regale, or the like. Against the morality of the view expressed by Cautus, p. 11,—viz. that 'the laity of the middle ages were great overgrown children, whom it was necessary for the Clergy to humour while they ruled them,' and that this fact might justify the appearance of 'dummy' laymen in ancient Synods, while the well-educated and well-taught laity of our own times are not to be trusted—we protest.

'The Nestorians and their Rituals.' (Masters.) This is a very important work, giving the annals of an interesting mission sent some years ago to the Nestorians in the person of Mr. Badger, a clergyman eminently qualified for the work. This mission—unhappily, as we think, relinquished—was conducted in a Church spirit, and had it been allowed to work out its course, might have counteracted much of the evil which is going on in the East, by the proselyting and schismatical proceedings which are countenanced by the Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem. The mission to the Nestorians had no sectarian purpose; it was simply to show the Orientals that our communion was a Church holding the creeds and catholic essentials. This object it materially gained; and there is something pathetic in the appeals urged by the Nestorian Patriarch to our own Bishops on the abandonment of the mission, just when it began to bear fruit and to be understood. Mr. Badger, in his first volume, gives the historical details of the mission, together with occasional and interesting descriptions of the country, its inhabitants, manners, and antiquities. In this last particular he is sometimes brought into collision with Mr. Layard. The second volume is given to an important translation of the extant Nestorian Rituals. Mr. Badger minimizes the importance of the Nestorian heresy: a sufficient counterpoise in this respect, however, is afforded by his Editor, Mr. Neale.

A useful and scholarly edition of the 'Apology of Theophilus of Antioch,' has been published under the auspices of the Syndics of the Cambridge Press, by Mr. W. G. Humphry. (J. W. Parker.)

We have received some very painful documents from the United States. An attack is organizing by the three Low Church Bishops of Virginia, (Meade,) Ohio, (M'Ilvaine,) and Maine, (Burgess,) upon the Bishop of New Jersey, (Doane.) The facts are, we believe, these:—Bishop Doane is, as everybody knows, a person of singular zeal and warmth of character. A certain impetuosity and lack of calculation is inseparable from this cast of mind. None can have read one of Bishop Doane's publications without understanding something of the man. Here is an extract taken quite at random from one of his recent publications: he is addressing his pupils of Burlington College. 'Go forth as men . . . Not men of any party. 'Not men exclusively of any State. Men of the whole Republic. Men of 'the Constitution. Men of this Union, now and for ever, one and indivisible. 'No fierce fanaticism of private prejudice. No idle phantom of a "higher 'law, which, like the wildfire of the bog, is never found, and never felt." ' &c. Here is the man, impetuous, irregular, picturesque, vehement, active, overflowing, kindling, and kindled. He deals in wild striking thoughts; he has a reckless dashing energy of speech and action; his prose abounds in a construction unknown to grammarians, the Nominative Absolute. Such as is his style, such, we have no doubt, is Bishop Doane's character. His episcopal income is very small, but he has established two flourishing and admirable institutions for education in his diocese, S. Mary's Hall, and Burlington College. The Bishop, with much more zeal than prudence, did everything *en grand*: spent all his resources, and borrowed money imprudently—availed himself of the facilities of raising funds which the United States afford—a monetary crisis occurs—and the Bishop is ruined. He does what is right—gives up his property—hands over the Colleges to trustees—does what he can. The creditors are satisfied—the matter is brought in May 1849 before the Convention of the Diocese; not one single voice is raised against the Bishop. We remember distinctly how on that occasion the lamented and valued Dr. Ogilby 'denounced the iniquity of founding any charge against the Bishop's moral character,' in connexion with this matter. The fervour and sincerity with which the Convention exonerated the Bishop, is fresh in our recollection. Here matters rest, until four persons, in August 1851, revive the charge, and enlist the triumvirate of Puritan Bishops. They, in September 1851, get up a letter conjointly to Bishop Doane, threatening him in a spirit of the utmost meekness, with proceedings before the Episcopal College. This epistle is not sent to Bishop Doane till February 1852; in the meantime, Bishop M'Ilvaine, in November, has an interview with Bishop Doane, and gives not the slightest intimation of the letter already two months old, and the impending prosecution already agreed upon. The whole thing is miserably transparent. It is a plot to crush Church principles. It is a direct conspiracy on the part of pledged partisans, against one whose chief fault is an uncalculating and imprudent carelessness in money matters, for the good of the Church. As such, we agree with Bishop Doane, in denouncing the move of the three associated Bishops. As was to be expected, the aggrieved

party, *more suo*, has issued a most indignant 'Reply,' which is satisfactory enough—and 'Protest.' We extract Bishop Doane's fervid conclusion:—

'And these are the four persons, and such are the charges, upon whose authority three Bishops of the Church of God, without acquaintance with the men, or inquiry as to their allegations, have relied, as the ground of criminal proceedings against their peer. Fearful indeed the reckoning they will have to meet. For the inroad which has thus been made upon the sacred sorrows of a desolate hearth; for the interruption of the daily duties of an office, which adds to the care of a parish and the care of two institutions in which two hundred of the sons and daughters of the Church are nurtured; for the storm which now must burst upon the peace and quiet of the Church; for this aggression on the Diocese of New Jersey; for this invasion of the rights of its Convention; for this injustice, indignity, and cruelty towards its Bishop—for the whole amount, and all the shapes, and every incident and consequence of this enormous wrong, the undersigned holds, as responsible, the Bishops of Virginia, Maine, and Ohio; accuses them before Christendom, and summons them, in all solemnity, before the judgment-seat of God.'

Mr. Keith Johnstone, so well and favourably known by his noble 'Physical Atlas,' has published a small but condensed and popular form of it in his 'School Atlas of Physical Geography.' (Blackwood.) We know nothing better calculated to arrest the attention of the young than these pictorial essays, if we may so call them. Geography in words is a dry and uninteresting subject: but in such a work as this it is clothed with life and reality. The relative proportion of land to water—the set of tides—the periodical drift of winds—the phenomena of meteorology—the distribution of heat and cold—the climatic apportionment of animal and vegetable life—even the ethnographic, educational, and religious statistics of man—are, in a suggestive and practical way, brought before the actual, as well as the mind's, eye. A companion volume, 'The General School Atlas,' which is neat and cheap, appears from the same editor and publishers.

Mr. Skinner's 'Guide for Lent,' (Hayes,) is earnest, deep, and sound. Without superseding, it equals most manuals already in use.—From the same publisher we have received Mr. Liddell's Sermon 'On the Division of Services,' preached at S. Barnabas, Pimlico, which is remarkable for its graceful and warm tribute to the character and successes of Mr. Bennett.

Connected with this, we have to acknowledge Mr. Bennett's touching and convincing 'Pastoral Letter to the Parishioners of Frome.' (Masters.) Touching and convincing we believe we may well call that, before which opposition so unworthily raised and fomented has died away. It is some consolation that the disastrous proceedings connected with S. Barnabas have had this termination.

'The Church Past and Present,' (Masters,) is the title of Four Advent Lectures on Church History, by Mr. Woodford, of Bristol. They are a clever synopsis: occasionally eloquent, always sensible. For ourselves—but perhaps it is a prejudice—we have the greatest dislike to the use by a preacher of the first person plural.

'Sayings and Doings of the Lord Bishop of Manchester,' (Masters,) by Mr. Edward Fellows, is authenticated by the writer's name. The Prelate who is the subject of this revelation—an unhappy one even if necessary—is becoming a bye-word.

'The English Constitution Vindicated,' (Masters,) is a confutation of Dr. Newman's Lectures. We hardly see the force of the title; but as an argument it is clear, and often deep. From the nature of the case it indicates rather than exhausts the controversy: for his main principle we can recommend this writer, who takes the name of 'Presbyter.'

Dr. Tischendorf has favoured us with a critical edition of the 'Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha,' (Lipsiæ: Avenarius et Mendelssohn; London: Dulau.) It is quite remarkable, that while general attention has been given to the Apocryphal Gospels, most of these Apocryphal Acts are now published for the first time. They have been known to Patristic scholars: occasionally they have been cited, but to our own times has been reserved a complete edition. The documents now printed are thirteen in number: of these Dr. Tischendorf prints from the Codices—1. The Acts of Philip. 2. The Acts of Philip in Greece. 3. The Acts of Matthew. 4. Consummatio Thomæ. 5. The Acts of Bartholomew. 6. The Acts of Thaddæus. 7. The Acts of John. Of the remaining six works, three—viz. 8. The Acts of Thomas; 9. Of Peter and Paul; 10. Of Andrew and Matthew—were published by Thilo in the years 1823–1846. 11. The Acts of Barnabas were published in an imperfect form by Papebroche in 1698: they are now restored. 12. The Acts of Andrew, *i.e.* the encyclical letter of the Clergy of Achaia on his martyrdom, were published from the Bodleian MS. at Leipsic in 1749, while 13. The Acts of Paul and Thecla, are printed in Grabe's 'Spicilegium.' In a full and able critical preface, Dr. Tischendorf discusses the age and authenticity of these curious and venerable monuments of Christian antiquity.

Mr. H. S. Tremenhære, under the title of 'The Political Experience of the Ancients, in its bearing on modern times,' (Murray,) has hit upon an excellent idea. He epitomizes the political writings of Aristotle, Plato, Polybius, and Cicero, and shows that there existed a catena of authorities on principles of government universally recognised down to the time of Locke.

M. Audin's thoroughly French and lively 'History of Henry VIII.' (Dolman,) has been translated by a Mr. E. G. Browne, a 'recent convert.' We have not examined the translation further than to see that it is an ugly double-columned book. The original we remember well: and it is caustic, bitter, unscrupulous, one-sided, and ultramontane—but very amusing.

'The Nourishment of the Christian Soul,' (Masters,) is from the French of Pinart; it is the companion, or continuation, of an affecting work by the same writer, 'Meditations on the Suffering Life of our Lord,' &c. Both appear under the editorship of the Bishop of Brechin, and both are of a spiritual and solemn character. They are 'adapted' to our own use: and their object is to assist and prevent vagueness in meditation.

Murray's 'Reading for the Rail'—a lively and tempting miscellany—gives

.....

[illegible]

Abstracts of the proceedings of the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 1998, are available in print and online. The online version is available at <http://www.apa.org/pubs/authors/1998/abstracts.html>. The print version is available at <http://www.apa.org/pubs/authors/1998/abstracts.html>.

There is a small number of cases reported involving the use of the product. These are listed in the accompanying table. The product is not intended for use in children. The product is not intended for use in pregnant women. The product is not intended for use in nursing mothers. The product is not intended for use in patients with known hypersensitivity to any of the ingredients. The product is not intended for use in patients with known hypersensitivity to any of the ingredients.

The second part of the "Real Deal" was a description of the economy. (Take a moment to really sit down with a pen and paper.) In many ways, indeed, it was a real deal with a combination of the old and the new, which is why it is the "Real Deal" in the first place.

[illegible]

success of which was complete. The 'Reviewer' has, we believe, issued a 'Rejoinder,' (Longman,) which was quite superfluous: the trial was over, and the verdict given. Besides, the libeller was understood; his object was transparent. A captain who neglects his company and his duties, is not very likely to find acceptance if he writes against his commanding officer. In a diocese like that of Exeter, we can quite understand that one whose whole episcopate has been devoted to work, and to improve the discipline and laborious life of his Clergy, may have made among certain specimens of them personal enemies. We only sincerely regret for the honour of literature that a journal like the Edinburgh Review should have lent itself to the unworthy work of permitting its channels to be made the means of avenging a merited slight—especially in the case of an English Bishop. A curious anecdote has come to our knowledge with respect to this article and the Bishop of Exeter's reply. An individual American Churchman has, at his own expense, caused an advertisement to be stitched into every copy of the Edinburgh Review circulated in America (where it is reprinted)—upwards of 4,000 in number—offering a copy *gratis* of an American edition, of the Bishop's 'Letter to Sir R. Inglis' to every subscriber to the Review. This high-minded act on the other side of the Atlantic almost atones for the miserable spirit displayed by the person who gave occasion to it.

Another, and in some respects more painful, incident connected with the diocese of Exeter has occurred. Miss Sellon's name and labours are as widely known as the Church of England. Her institutions and the labours and loving-kindness of the devoted sisterhood of which she is the Superior, are a boast of our own days. And yet a man has been found to sneer, not so much at the peculiarities of an individual, as at the 'Sisters of Mercy,' as such,—or else why maliciously quote the title as an eminent jest?—a gentleman, by education, has been found to publish a lady's private letters without her consent; a Clergyman has been found to pass over the whole life of many women, spent in visiting the sick, and feeding the hungry, and teaching the ignorant, for a matter of crosses, and a pair of candlesticks, and a picture. One Mr. James Spurrell has got hold of 'a Sister who has recently seceded,' to use his own words, and as it would seem for the especial edification of those who laugh at all religion, prints gossip about the way, if uncommon, in which recluse women try to do good to their neighbours. He calls his pamphlet, 'Miss Sellon and "the Sisters of Mercy,"' and it has Mr. Hatchard's respectable name affixed to it. With the Bishop of Exeter we stigmatize Mr. Spurrell's share in this transaction as simply 'infamous.' At the Bishop's desire Miss Sellon prepares a 'Reply.' (Masters.) This is guarded, temperate, and convincing: on one or two points Miss Sellon expresses herself in such a way, as to the moral interpretation of the rule which gives permission to the Sisters to retire, and on the matter of obedience, that the Bishop, who was *ex officio* visitor, feels himself called upon, in a 'Letter to Miss Sellon,' (Murray,) to relinquish that office. If unavoidable, this result is certainly to be deplored: but it is some alleviation to be assured that the good work is so far consolidated that it can stand alone. We

us two instalments: 'Deeds of Naval Daring,' which we should say was not safe for mothers to put into the hands of boys who have decidedly nautical appetencies: and 'Music and the Art of Dress,' which, at least the latter, lies under the like difficulties as to our daughters.

Mr. E. A. Freeman's 'Paper on the Preservation and Restoration of Ancient Monuments,' (J. H. Parker,) was read before the Archæological Institute at their recent *séance* at Bristol. It attracted, as it deserved, a good deal of notice; and, as its author doubtless expected, it provoked unfavourable remarks. It is clever, suggestive, and well written; not without strong expressions, for Mr. Freeman thinks decidedly, and expresses himself accordingly. In some notes, Mr. Freeman takes, or makes, occasion to review his reviewers. In the castigation which he bestows on a writer in Fraser, who, himself a reviewer, and an 'anonymous hired writer,' felt, after the manner of his sect, it to be his function to abuse reviews in general with a bitterness of execration only suitable to the pen of one whose vocation it is to rebuke strong writing, we for the most part concur. 'Tis sport to see the engineer,' &c.

Much above the average of tour books is 'Letters from Italy and Vienna.' (Macmillan.) The writer is observant—generally candid and fair: his language is graphic, and he does justice to the good, while he is severe to the evil, both of his own religious system and that of others. He does not use guide-book slang, and sees with his own eyes. We detected one slight inaccuracy, p. 67. 'To prevent any egregious blunder 'in an ignorant priest, I observed that the quantities were *marked* in *their* 'books.' Was not this the ordinary accentuation to direct the intoning: the ' rather than ~?

There is a good deal of simple vigour—not the worse, perhaps, for recalling days gone by—in Archdeacon Berens' 'Adherence to the Church.' (Rivingtons.) For ordinary cases of distribution in villages infested by 'meetings,' this is a suitable little collection.

The second part of the 'Small Book' on the 'State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity,' (Pickering,) by no means disposes us to reverse or to modify the opinion which we were obliged to give of its predecessor. In many respects, indeed, this writer deteriorates as he advances: not content with a latitudinarian view for himself, he misrepresents the orthodox and historical belief; as in the account which he gives, p. 18, of the doctrine referred to Arius, or Areius, as the present writer prefers to spell it.

Contemporaneously with our last number appeared the 'Edinburgh Review.' This respectable journal was disfigured with an article, on which literature and the public sense of outraged decency soon set its seal. We believe that hitherto the press, in all its organs, and representing all views, parties, and polemics, has been unanimous in condemning the venomous and personal attack contained in the paper headed 'Bishop Philpotts,' which appeared in the January number of our contemporary. The Bishop replied in a most temperate and dignified pamphlet, 'A Letter to Sir Robert Inglis on certain Statements in an Article of the Edinburgh Review,' (Murray,) the

success of which was complete. The 'Reviewer' has, we believe, issued a 'Rejoinder,' (Longman,) which was quite superfluous: the trial was over, and the verdict given. Besides, the libeller was understood; his object was transparent. A captain who neglects his company and his duties, is not very likely to find acceptance if he writes against his commanding officer. In a diocese like that of Exeter, we can quite understand that one whose whole episcopate has been devoted to work, and to improve the discipline and laborious life of his Clergy, may have made among certain specimens of them personal enemies. We only sincerely regret for the honour of literature that a journal like the Edinburgh Review should have lent itself to the unworthy work of permitting its channels to be made the means of avenging a merited slight—especially in the case of an English Bishop. A curious anecdote has come to our knowledge with respect to this article and the Bishop of Exeter's reply. An individual American Churchman has, at his own expense, caused an advertisement to be stitched into every copy of the Edinburgh Review circulated in America (where it is reprinted)—upwards of 4,000 in number—offering a copy *gratis* of an American edition, of the Bishop's 'Letter to Sir R. Inglis' to every subscriber to the Review. This high-minded act on the other side of the Atlantic almost atones for the miserable spirit displayed by the person who gave occasion to it.

Another, and in some respects more painful, incident connected with the diocese of Exeter has occurred. Miss Sellon's name and labours are as widely known as the Church of England. Her institutions and the labours and loving-kindness of the devoted sisterhood of which she is the Superior, are a boast of our own days. And yet a man has been found to sneer, not so much at the peculiarities of an individual, as at the 'Sisters of Mercy,' as such,—or else why maliciously quote the title as an eminent jest?—a gentleman, by education, has been found to publish a lady's private letters without her consent; a Clergyman has been found to pass over the whole life of many women, spent in visiting the sick, and feeding the hungry, and teaching the ignorant, for a matter of crosses, and a pair of candlesticks, and a picture. One Mr. James Spurrell has got hold of 'a Sister who has recently seceded,' to use his own words, and as it would seem for the especial edification of those who laugh at all religion, prints gossip about the way, if uncommon, in which recluse women try to do good to their neighbours. He calls his pamphlet, 'Miss Sellon and "the Sisters of Mercy,"' and it has Mr. Hatchard's respectable name affixed to it. With the Bishop of Exeter we stigmatize Mr. Spurrell's share in this transaction as simply 'infamous.' At the Bishop's desire Miss Sellon prepares a 'Reply.' (Masters.) This is guarded, temperate, and convincing: on one or two points Miss Sellon expresses herself in such a way, as to the moral interpretation of the rule which gives permission to the Sisters to retire, and on the matter of obedience, that the Bishop, who was *ex officio* visitor, feels himself called upon, in a 'Letter to Miss Sellon,' (Murray,) to relinquish that office. If unavoidable, this result is certainly to be deplored: but it is some alleviation to be assured that the good work is so far consolidated that it can stand alone. We

trust that Miss Sellon's vindication, complete as far as all essentials go, coupled with two testimonies to the facts of the practical institutions in which the sisterhood is engaged, furnished by the Plymouth Clergy, and printed as an Appendix to the Bishop's 'Letter,' will give renewed energy to her friends, and confidence, and perhaps other lessons, to herself. We may, perhaps, regret some of Miss Sellon's language: we may think her views, both of herself, and of her own, and of the Bishop's, position exaggerated. But were her views of her vocation theoretically more extreme than they are, it were very base to forget that her character has also a practical side by way of complement and abatement. High as is her estimate of her position and her aspirations, her actual self-denial and working virtues are higher. Before we criticise too coldly or too severely the sentiments of working persons, let us do justice to the working life. This is a question of something else than taste. We may not like Miss Sellon's mode of expressing herself: but she has paid dearly for exaggerated language. When we have many Miss Sellons we will permit criticism more readily than we are disposed to do at present. Mr. Spurrell certainly has yet his credentials to produce for the dangerous office of 'accuser of the brethren.

Anything which proceeds from Dr. Maitland's pen is sure to be learned, entertaining, and original, if partial. His recently printed 'Eight Essays,' (Rivingtons,) with most of which we were familiar, quite come up to our expectations: and in this quarter they are always high. If the accomplished writer intends us to accept his views on art and its literalness, we do not accompany him: but we cannot be quite certain that there is not in these speculations a refined irony. Does Dr. Maitland understand, (p. 117,) that the allegorical Bas-Reliefs on the Fish-street Hill monument are not there now. The inscription was erased: but King Charles and Duke James, and London weeping most stony tears, are all there, with the congenial Cupids and uncongenial Genius.

'Polonius: a Collection of Wise Saws and Modern Instances,' (Pickering,) is a book of proverbs and adages. From the nature of the case it contains sayings of various proprieties and principles: and on this account shares the moral disadvantages under which all such Morality-Books labour. A collection of apophthegms or *Ana* from a single writer or thinker has its value, because a definite one, and as the reflection of a single mind: but if Carlyle and Newman, Pascal, Goethe, and Bishop Butler, can be worked up into a consistent ethical whole, it is curious. By the way, in all such books we should like references: if the sayings are good for anything, we occasionally wish for the context. Now, to append 'Seneca,' or 'Edinburgh Review,' or 'Plato,' is at least perplexing.

Mr. Goode, the stormy petrel of his party, has printed a 'Reply to Archdeacon Churton and Chancellor Harrington,' (Hatchard,) on the 'Non-Episcopal Question.' Seeing Mr. Goode in print about six times a quarter, and always in the contradictory way, we must do him the justice of saying that his friends give him no respite: the solitary man of letters

of an illiterate party has to do more than a working man's share of work. Just to think of a life—which is Mr. Goode's—spent from year's end to year's end groping and delving in the unfathomable rubbish of Travers and Cartwright, and the illustrious obscure of a defunct Puritanism. Mr. Goode has a severe price to pay for his literary Swerga. The function of Answerer-General has, of course, its difficulties and unpleasantnesses. Mr. Goode must make up his mind to the inconveniences as well as honours of his solitary position. To the world it argues a captious, querulous, snarling temper: but there is no remedy for it. 'It is' Mr. Goode's 'nature to'—as Dr. Watts expresses it—*i.e.* to argufy and to contradict. He advertises, we see, something fresh against the Bishop of Exeter, a matter in which he was not called upon to interfere, 'in defence of his Metropolitan,' except on the ground that he obtained a good living for abusing the Bishop of Exeter, and he must render the customary suit and service.

In 'A Few Words,' &c. (Rivingtons,) we think Chancellor Harington has disposed of Mr. Goode's verbosity on a question which, while the simple fact remains that these non-episcopal ordinations are not acknowledged in this Church of England, never required half a page of discussion.

An able and vigorous coadjutor has appeared in the 'Scottish Magazine,' (new series,) (Lendrum,) of which we have received the first volume.

'The Patriarch of the Nile,' by J. D. Pigott. (Rivingtons.) We hardly think the subject very susceptible of poetical treatment; but the writer has done his best.

'The Three Paths,' by the Hon. Mrs. Anderson, (Rivingtons,) we think would be benefited by condensation.

The South Church Union have adopted tactics of a singularly bold and aggressive character, and, as we hear, with considerable success. Selecting Brighton, the metropolis of idleness, and gaiety, and lounging, of a literary as well as another kind, some active persons have hit upon the scheme of delivering public lectures—and, without mincing the matter,—'On Tractarianism.' (Masters.) Mr. Newland's lecture on this subject is before us: assuming the policy and propriety of the thing itself, Mr. Newland is eminently qualified for this work. It is plain-spoken—picturesque—and very popular in style and manner. For the lecture-room these are great qualities. Mr. Newland calls a spade a spade: and if he could find out a more intelligible and vernacular name he would not scruple to use it. That there is a tendency in this to rudeness, is to our minds no real objection: the people who are addressed are rude, if not in manners yet, in information: the thing to be done being agreed upon, *this* is the only way of doing it. Mr. Neale—of whose versatile powers this is only another specimen—follows, with the 'Bible and the Bible only the Religion of Protestants'—a merciless and sarcastic demolition of this silly axiom. High colouring and a decided touch these lectures require: but we detected Mr. Neale in an unnecessary piece of exaggeration, p. 18. 'When Hoadley was denying the sacraments . . . when Cornwallis was dancing away his

evenings at Lambeth, till George III. peremptorily interfered.' We have heard of a saltatory chancellor in Hatton, but we never heard of an archbishop dancing *in persona*, as Mr. Neale assures us. What King George interfered with was—not Archbishop Cornwallis dancing himself, or giving dances to others: but—with Mrs. Cornwallis's routs; which, though akin to, is certainly not quite the same thing as 'Cornwallis dancing away his evenings at Lambeth.'

'The Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal,' (Grant,) has reached us in its first complete volume. It is a periodical of a high range of intelligence, and cannot but be useful and acceptable.

'Tracts on Catholic Unity,' (Darling.) The purpose of these tracts is to collect into an accessible form the arguments and principles advanced by the Syncretic school. As a contribution to peace and a healing measure, we presume that no Christian mind will refuse to accept the purpose of such a series. The Evangelical Alliance takes one form of the purpose; Davenport (Santa Clara) another; Bossuet another; Leibnitz another; Mr. Wix, in the beginning of the century, another; Mr. Appleyard recently another; while neither the attempts made by the nonjurors or by some of ourselves to open up intercourse with the Oriental Churches are to be excluded from this peace-loving end. The Editors are members of the Church of England. A trace of exaggerated language is beginning to display itself in No. 4, from which we thought its predecessors free.

Dr. Peile's 'Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles,' (Rivingtons,) has reached its fourth and concluding volume. In so vast a body of annotations we cannot be expected to concur entirely. But the learning, diligence, fairness, and scholarship exhibited go far towards redeeming the imputation under which we lie for neglecting exegetical studies.

'How can we best have Three Services instead of Two?' is a question 'examined and replied to by Mr. W. J. Stracey.' (Masters.) Mr. Stracey confines himself to the Sunday services. He argues, and we are not prepared to pronounce decidedly and at once against the view, that when the Litany is ordered to be said *after* Morning Prayer, this does not, or may not necessarily, mean '*immediately* after.' All that it need mean, he says, is that the Litany is not to be used before Morning Prayer. He then goes on to show that it is not implied that the Litany should be invariably said before the Holy Communion; from which his conclusion is, that the Morning Prayer should make one Sunday Office, the Liturgy the second, or afternoon, and Evening Prayer the third. We are glad to find Mr. Stracey giving no countenance to the unfortunate innovation of an evening celebration of the Eucharist.

'The Ark, and other Sermons,' by Mr. R. Bellis, (J. W. Parker,) in so far as it claims readers on the strength of 'a Preface by Rev. A. McCaul, D.D., Professor of Divinity at King's College, London,' is a literary fraud. The Preface is a couple of pages, in which the reverend Professor idealises Popish sermons and rationalizing sermons, and then assures us that

Mr. Bellis' discourses are neither one nor the other. Perhaps: but, to change the Professor's antithesis, they 'are to us a proof of the possibility of being pretentious without originality, and pert without power.' Instead of printing his own, 'the Curate of High Wycombe and Theological Associate of King's College' would have been much better employed in reading other people's sermons.

A second volume of 'Village Sermons,' by Mr. A. Baxter, of Hampreston, from the same publisher, struck us much by their simplicity and suitability to place and occasion.

We can assure Mr. Wilmshurst that we have no especial fault to find with his 'Sermons.' (Masters.) He intimates that they were 'drawn up under peculiar circumstances:' and we are not concerned to be inquisitive what those circumstances were. The writer is very modest: he does not pretend to originality. He has read the right sort of books, and his sermons are in doctrine a syllabus—not always accurate, however—of Bull and Newman on Justification, and on the harmony of the two Apostles. He seems to be sound on other points: and there are in his sermons traces of a practical spirit and a real appreciation of the wants of those he is addressing. But the first sermon we turned to (Serm. iv. p. 33) commences thus: 'Conversion is the responsibility of man yielding to the suasive influence of 'the preventing grace of the Holy Spirit as it would lead him, (after it has 'laid open to him his lost estate as a fallen creature, and the necessity of 'his being recovered from that state, before he can be fitted for Heaven,) to 'lay hold of by faith through its appointed channel of Baptism, that gift of 'grace which is ordained to effect this recovery, and to accomplish that 'increase in holiness which he is capable of now, as a Baptised man, he is 'placed in a recovered state, viz.: Christ's righteousness.' Now, supposing this sentence to be grammar, which it is not—and admitting its good intention to express accurately a technical statement in theology—we ask one question: Mr. Wilmshurst is Curate of Kirby Muxloe and Braunstone, and we presume that the rustics of those famous villages were expected to hear the sermon decorated with this beginning. Did it ever occur to Mr. Wilmshurst what impression such an exordium would make upon the congregation of Muxloe? It is the boast of our Church that its services should be 'understood of the people:' why should not her Clergy extend this merciful provision to the Sermon?

Mr. Stuart's Sermon on the 'Pew System,' (Masters,) is unusually interesting; the author having shown his thorough appreciation of his principle by building and endowing a handsome new Church without pews and pew-rents.

Of Sermons, we have to acknowledge: 1. A Volume (the second) displaying considerable force of language and an animated pictorial style, together with sound and practical doctrine, by Mr. Edward Miller, of Bognor. (Rivingtons.)—2. A Volume by Dr. Wilkinson, preached in the chapel of Marlborough College. (Murray.) These are generally so useful, so much to the purpose, so direct and intelligible, that in alluding—grace-

fully enough—to his unpolemical object in preaching them, we think the respected preacher might have spared some observations in his preface which look like unnecessary reflections on others. It is Dr. Wilkinson's especial purpose to teach his boys; it may be somebody else's purpose to discharge other functions in the Church. Why should not each hold his own—and do good each in his own way? Even to 'discuss management clauses,' as he puts it, may, in the great Ecclesiastical Economy, have a purpose as useful as the doctrine of the verbs in μ . We are sure that Dr. Wilkinson acknowledges this as frankly as we admit that the master of a great school has a great religious charge; and it is a consolation to know that in most of our public schools—and most certainly in Marlborough, under Dr. Wilkinson's auspices—this responsibility is acted up to;—as we are reminded by a good single Sermon, 'Witnesses to the Truth,' preached at Harrow School by Dr. Vaughan, on the death of Mr. Keary, an Assistant-Master, (J. W. Parker,) as well as by a very graceful and ingenious 'Founders' Day Sermon,' preached at the Charter-house, 'Education the Business of Life,' (Walker,) by Mr. Phillott, lately one of the masters. We have also received, 1. 'Deserters from the Congregation,' also by Dr. Vaughan, (J. W. Parker,) on the reopening of S. Martin's, Leicester. We cannot coincide in some of its statements. 2. 'The Ministry of Reconciliation,' by Mr. E. T. Vaughan, (J. W. Parker,) the Vicar, preached on the same occasion. 3. 'Ritual Worship,' (Harrison,) preached at Leeds at a consecration—a very good sermon—by Mr. C. Dodgson. 4. Mr. B. Wilson's 'Four Sermons on the Deity and Incarnation of our Lord,' (Rivingtons,) preached at Fordham. 5. Mr. Nowell's 'Farewell Sermon' at S. Mary, Leeds. (Harrison.) 6. 'One and All,' an able lecture, by Mr. Newland, delivered at Stoke Damerel, (Masters.)

While we are at press, we have received Mr. C. Wordsworth's 'Letter to Mr. Gladstone,' (J. H. Parker.) It appears to be a protest against the possibility of combining liberal politics with Church principles.

INDEX TO VOL. XXIII.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Æschylus, Paley's edition of the *Supplices*, 453—487. Neglect of Æschylus, 453. Previous editions, 454. Detailed criticisms and explanations, 455—487.
American Church [*Caswall's America and the American Church*], 329—363. Mr. Caswall's practical acquaintance with his subject, 329. Relations of English and American Churches, 330, 331. History of the American Church, 332—338. Bishop Chase, 339—344. Mr. Caswall's career, 345—348. Bishop Doane and his institutions, 349. Synods, 350. General sketch of the constitution and practice of the American Church, 351—363.

B.

Budhism—Tartary and Thibet [*Travels by M. Hue. Spence Hardy's Eastern Monachism, &c.*], 249—328. The Lazarist Mission, 249, 250. Quits China, 252. Hospitality of the Orientals, 253, 254. Arrives at the Blue Town, 257—260. The Tartar rule and character, 261. Thibet, 262. Parallel between Lassa and Rome, 263. Life at, and departure from Lassa, 264—273. Return of the Mission to China, 274—277. Several views of Budhism, 278—328.

C.

Clerical education [*Mr. Freeman's Plea for Education of the Clergy*], 217—236. Analysis of Mr. Freeman's pamphlet, 217—223. English education deficient, 224. *Desiderata* in specific clerical training, 225—236.

NO. LXXVI.—N.S.

College Life in time of James I. [*Sir Symonds D'Ewes' Journal*], 30—44. Value of this Journal, 30, 31. Picture of the age, 32—44.
Conception, the Immaculate [*Perrone's Disquisition on the Immaculate Conception*], 364—425. What the 'Conception' is, 364, 365. Source of immaculateness, 366. View of the doctrine, 367. The Canons of Lyons, 368. S. Bernard, P. Lombard, 369, 370. Council of Basle, 371. University of Paris, 372. Progress of the doctrine, 373, 374. Its proofs, 375; from Scripture and the Fathers, 376, &c. How they fail, and uncertainty among its advocates, 376—421. Appendix. Office of the Feast, &c. 422—425.

Convocation in 1852 [*Pearce's Law of Convocation*], 488—494. Growth and progress of the desire for Synodical action, 488. The new Convocation, 489. Authentic account of the proceedings of the last Session of Convocation, 490—494.

Copleston, Bishop [*Memoir of Bishop Copleston*], 1—29. Popularity of Dr. Copleston, 1. His biography, 2. Tutor of Oriel, 3. His general character and politics: Dean and Bishop, 4—15. A disappointing character, 16. Incapable of acting upon the Church movement, 17—29.

Creasy's Decisive Battles [*The Fifteen Decisive Battles, &c.*], 207—216. Which are the fifteen battles, 207. Marathon, 208, 209. Syracuse, 210. Arbela, 211. The Metaurus, 212. Victory of Arminius, 213. Châlons, 214. Charles Martel's victory over the Saracens, 215, 216.

Cuthbert, S. [*Eyre's History of S. Cuthbert*], 64—88. Obscurity of S. Cuthbert's age, 64. His life, 65, and its lessons, 66—81. Miracles attributed to him, 85. Hagiology in general, 85—88.

M M

J.

Jansenists, the; and recent Ultramontaniam [*Rohrbacher's History of the Church—Tregelles on Jansenism*], 89—152. What the History of the Church is, 89. Rohrbacher's work, 89—91. Antonio de Dominis in 1602, 93. His struggles and history, 93—100. Richer, 101. The Abbé of S. Cyran and Vincent of Paul, 102, 103. Jansenius, 104. Rohrbacher's exhibition of the Roman doctrine on grace, 105. That of S. Thomas, 106. Of Molina, 107. Of Jansenius in the *Augustinus*, 108. Dispute on the Five Propositions, 109. Progress of the controversy, 110. Decline and fall of Jansenism in France, 127. The Church of Utrecht—its connexion with Jansenism, 128. History of the protesting Episcopate, and its recent and present con-
 dition, 129—152.

M.

Mormons, the [*The Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints*], 186—206. The 'American Mahomet,' 186, 187. Joseph Smith, 188, 189. The Mormon creed, 190, 191; its reference to Scripture, 192, 193; its hymnology, 194; its origin, 195—197. Progress of Mormonism, 198—206.

O.

Ossoli, Margaret Fuller [*Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli*], 426—452. American estimate of celebrities, 426. Margaret Fuller's birth and education, 427. Her career and character, 428—452.

P.

Ponsonby, Lady E., Novels by [*The Discipline of Life, &c.*], 45—63. Is fiction to be abandoned? 45. Province of fiction, 46—49. Lady E. Ponsonby as a novelist, 49. Criticism of her novels, 50—63.

S.

Sterling, John [*Carlyle's Life of Sterling*], 153—185. Carlyle and Hare, 153. Carlyle's sense of sham, 154; its use and abuse, 155—161. Sterling, 161; his life and character, 162, 163. Sterling's father, 164—167. The present biography criticised, 168—185.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY.—Tales of a London Parish—Cousin Eustace—Birks' Life of Bickersteth—Home is Home—Record of Exeter Synod—Scudamore on Romanism—England before the Norman Conquest—Rural Thoughts, &c.—Corner's History of Greece—Tales of the Empire—The Pastor Visiting—Christ in Hades—Bennett's Sermons—Armitstead's Parochial Papers—The Monthly Packet—The Lily and the Bee—Heygate's Care of the Soul—Church Catechism, expanded—Westcott's Elements of Gospel Harmony—Mahan on Faith—Stapf on Education—Kennaway's Sermons—Parker's Pascal—Letters on Irish Reformation—Currey's Lectures—Foulkes' Manual of Ecclesiastical History—Bishop Hall's Meditations—Welch Sketches—Babylon and Jerusalem—Mould, Baron, and Laurence, on Visiting the Sick—Bishop Pearson's Annals—Montgomery's Poems—A Gift at Confirmation—New Zealand—On State of Man, &c.—Lees on Wild Flowers—Hayman's Dialogues—Walcott on the Ordinal—Palin's History of Church, &c.—Land of the Morning—First Hebrew Book—Simpson on Italian Literature—Oxford Statutes—Schoell on British History—Cockerell's Wells Cathedral—Moody's New Testament—Forbes on the Eucharist—Whitaker's Almanacs—Parker on the Church—Meyrick and Debary on the Spanish Church—Vaux's Handbook—Reading for the Rail—Maurice on the Old Testament—Holmes on Diocesan Synods—Pound on Ditto—Harington on LV. Canon—Armstrong on Penitentiaries—Denison, Newland, and Hare, on Education—Jackson's Tracts—Sermons, &c. by Dr. Crosse, Bishop Doane, &c.—Bowman to Medical Students—Bowdler on Confession, &c.—Caswall's American Church—Williams on the Apocalypse—The Truth about Rome—Bishop of Oxford's Jubilee Sermon—Sermons, &c. by Huxtable, Vaughan, Williams, Pearson, Hook, Bishop Fulford, Perry, &c.—Postscript, &c.

APRIL.—Review of Mr. Barber's Case—Clinton's Fasti Hellenici—Hemfrey's Vegetation of Europe—Alison's Life of Marlborough—Ellis on Irish Ethnology—Manual of Hebrew Antiquities—Watkins on the Human Hand—Bowen's Mount Athos—The Sarum Psalter—Protestant Prayer-Book—Gentle Influences—Bishop of Tasmania's Charge—Bishop of Guiana's Charge—Gladstone's Letter to Bishop of Aberdeen—Cautus' Reply—Badger's Nestorians—Humphry's Edition of Theophilus—Bishop Doane's Protest and Appeal—Keith Johnstone's Physical Atlas and School Atlas—Skinner's Guide for Lent—Liddell on Division of Services—Bennett's Pastoral Letter—Woodford's Lectures—Sayings and Doings of Bishop of Manchester—Confutation of Dr Newman—Tischendorf's Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles—Tremenheere's Ancient Politics—Audin's Henry VIII.—Nourishment of Christian Soul—Reading for the Rail—Freeman on the Preservation of Ancient Monuments—Letters from Italy and Vienna—Berens on the Church—State of Man subsequent to Christianity—Edinburgh Review and Bishop of Exeter—Spurrell, and 'The Sisters of Mercy—Dr. Maitland's Eight Essays—Polonius &c.—Mr. Goode's Reply to Archdeacon Churton and Chancellor Harington—Harington's Few Words—Scottish Magazine—Piggott's Patriarch of the Nile—The Three Paths—The South Church Union—Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal—Tracts on Catholic Unity—Dr. Pelle's Annotations on the Epistles—Stracey's Three Services instead of Two—The Ark, &c.—Baxter's Village Sermons—Wilmshurst's Sermons—Stuart on the Pew System—Wordsworth's Letter to Mr. Gladstone—Sermons by Miller, Wilkinson, Vaughan, Phillott, Dodgson, Wilson, Nowell, and Newland.

of some 'Discussions on several passages of History and Mythology,' an original and not uninteresting attempt to mould into form and order some of the doubts and fancies which the Wolf and Bryant school of criticism brought into fashion. Whatever may be thought of the value of the theories propounded in those works, there can be little question of their being the production of an able and capacious mind animated with all the ardour necessary for the deepest research. So far our author presents sufficient credentials for this his latest task. But the hand which clears the rubbish from the surface of the mine, and opens the first glimpse of the bright veins beneath, performs too often a thankless labour. To remove such a reproach is our present object. It is simply our desire to draw attention to and acknowledge the obligation which works like that before us confer on our literature, hoping that the time may not be far distant when the inquiries here instituted may awaken a corresponding spirit of research, and elicit, what they at least deserve, a deliberate disproof. The doctrine of the 'Cyclops' unfuted tends to dissipate at once the theories of the scholar and the traditions of the unlearned; and lest any one rashly condemn it as fanciful or imaginative, let him remember how simply mythical are all the present notions which, in the absence of sure tradition, we entertain on the subject—mythical too, without rhyme or reason in their falsehood. Mr. Herbert has wrought a great work, if it is only to rescue from obscurity the antimyth of Stonehenge—the true poetical, if not the real historical, version of its origin.

We will abstain here from criticising the real value of the quotations made from the obsolete learning of our author, but will, for the present purpose, take them upon trust, '*perito cuique in arte sua credendum est*;' for we think we shall better deserve the thanks of those who have not time to go through this laborious work, if we endeavour to present them with a slight sketch of some of Mr. Herbert's arguments and general results.

The first part of his task is devoted to the refutation of established traditional prejudice, which, lichen-like, has obscured the original characters imprinted on all monuments of old, rendering them illegible to any but a zealous and discriminating inquirer.

Mr. Herbert contends that it is erroneous to infer, in the absence of any more certain information, that the date of megalithic works *must* be carried back to a remote age, and their origin ascribed to a 'nation of whom tradition has scarcely preserved the name.' 'Antiquity,' Mr. Herbert argues, is essentially a relative term, most grievously abused in common parlance. It is, in fact, to the modern archæologist what the Hyperboreans

or the Pygmies were to the old geographers. As there was nothing too marvellous to be predicated of those nations, so there is no difficulty or absurdity, no inconsistency whatever, which has not been evaded under the convenient shelter of a mysterious antiquity.

Another error consists in supposing that the mere shapelessness and rudeness of megalithic works entitle them to the designation of *ancient*. 'The inference of antiquity,' says our author, 'from rudeness and simplicity of style, is but vague and declamatory. Fine works adorned Nineveh and the oldest empires on record, and rude ones satisfy many nations at this day, and will hereafter. Though rudeness or polish may sometimes distinguish the infancy or maturity of a given state, they may also distinguish its maturity from its last decline; but they can never indicate mere time. Phidias was not a modern, though he lived at a late epoch of the city of Cecrops.' (P. 80.) And he adds: 'But this topic fails entirely when the works, rude and fierce in their taste, imply much resource of art and wealth; for taste or fanaticism may affect stern forms, either inventing them, reviving them, or importing them from abroad. Therefore the argument (from style) destroys itself, or assumes this arbitrary shape: that the primitive ages, and they alone, combined skill with an austere style. Surely this (*sc.* that of Stonehenge) is one of the cases in which (as Lord Aberdeen says of the Attic coinage) the affectation of an archaic style of work is easily distinguished from the rudeness of remote antiquity.'

But the arch-error, in our author's view, with regard particularly to the works under our consideration, is the attributing them, directly or indirectly, to the Druids; or, to express ourselves more correctly, the placing their origin in a period anterior to the Roman advent. We were, we confess, so great was the force of habit, somewhat startled by our author's formal scepticism on this head. For though the hypothesis which he rejects has been often questioned and apparently matched with opposite hypotheses, yet its acceptance always seemed to us, on the whole, to be a case somewhat like that which a great modern statesman has called '*le triomphe du pis aller*.' Indeed, its 'tenure by sufferance' was so far established, that Sir Richard Hoare, with some qualification, admits its claim; for, after reviewing the results of his several predecessors' inquiries, he expresses his conclusion that though the Druids may have been the ministers, yet they were not the *masons* of these temples, which were probably the rude work of the primitive Celts or Belgic tribes, who first colonised our island. Now, we confess, with all submission, that this distinction, though apparently adverse to, is in

fact not inconsistent with, the prevalent notion. For, it is scarcely probable that a proud priesthood like the Druids, who were at once the rulers and teachers of the nation, would identify themselves with any system of worship,—Celtic, Belgic, or Teutonic,—to the establishment of which they were not parties; but if they did identify themselves with any such system, the temples designed and completed in their times, and for the purpose of such worship, might, in general parlance, be said to have been *built* by them, though they exercised no more superintendence over the mere masonry, than did Cheops over the Pyramid, or William of Wykeham over his chapels and cloisters at Winchester and Oxford.

The 'Quarterly Review,' No. XII., in its notice of Sir Richard Hoare's work, gives countenance to the Druidical hypothesis; and we believe it has till now remained substantially unassailed. But Mr. Herbert, disputing its claim simply on its merits, suggests two propositions for our consideration: one, that these temples are not Druidic, nor ante-Roman; the other, that they really and in fact bear the impress of a much more modern date. On the former of these it will be enough, we think, to read his objections, to feel that they are entitled to great consideration.

As to his first proposition, he argues *à priori*, that assuming all we have heard about the Druids to be true, we are guilty of inconsistency in assigning to their times and agency the construction of such temples as Abury and Stonehenge, because we thereby attribute to the same people, at the same period, and under the same circumstances, a two-fold system of worship.¹ If, as we have been taught, their favourite and most efficacious sacrifice was the burning of a wicker giant, with its enclosed hecatomb of human beings,—their most sacred shrine, the mystic oaken grove in the depth of the forest,—how can we account for the simultaneous use of so different a ritual as these temples would imply, celebrated in rude circles of stones on the open champaign, and of which the chief feature was the altar offering? Reasonable doubts have been entertained by most antiquaries whether *altars*, in the sense in which we understand the word, are described in the accounts of the religious ceremonies of the Druids, (see Mr. Herbert's 2d Section and note 3,) whereas all agree in discovering the *ara* amongst the remains of these temples which we are considering, with its 'ring-stone,' to which the victim was tied previous to the sacrifice.

¹ Dr. Henry has indeed endeavoured to combine the two systems. He speaks of groves, 'in the centre of which were rows of large stones set perpendicular in the earth.' But Stonehenge stood in the midst of a *barren* plain; while the nature of the works at Abury would seem to preclude trees as part of the original design.

Mr. Herbert's second objection on this head is still more striking. He contends, apparently with no less force than justice, that supposing the colossal system of works, which we generally call Druidic, to have existed in Britain in the times of those classical authors from whom we derive all our knowledge of our country and its inhabitants in those ages, it is hardly credible that they should not have noticed them.¹ Yet all are silent. The fact is unimpeachable. Of one thing we may be certain, that whatever was the cause of their silence, it is not to be attributed to their underrating such striking objects. We should as soon expect that Herodotus could have walked through Egypt, and omitted all notice of the Pyramids. It would be, indeed, past belief that men like Cæsar, Tacitus, and Pliny—the Napier, the Macaulay, and the Heeren of the age, to say nothing of a host of others, poets as well as prose writers, by whom Britain was rendered famous—should, even if they themselves had not felt very deeply impressed by such monuments, have thought an Abury or a Stonehenge unworthy of notice in their pages, whether their object was merely to gratify a taste for eloquent description, or a love of the marvellous, or to answer the more solid purpose of theorising upon the character and religion of a new and wild people.

Many of these authors have minutely portrayed the Druidic system in Gaul² as well as in Britain; they have dwelt with graphic horror upon the fierce rites and incantations, the forest temples, the savage gods. It is inconceivable, therefore, that they should intentionally, and as if by concert, have been silent upon these the most stupendous features of a foreign superstition. We can hardly evade this difficulty by supposing that such works *escaped* the notice of observant men, especially Cæsar, who, as leader of the earliest invading force, was in continual collision with that fierce and potent hierarchical government which presented the main obstacle to the Roman progress. He it was who spared no effort to eradicate an order that exercised such dangerous influence. He invariably acted upon the method enjoined upon the iconoclasts of the Scripture history,

¹ It is impossible to wrest any favourable meaning out of the language of Tacitus in the passage supposed to allude to megalithic works. Ann. xii. 35.

² We may add here a remark for which we cannot find a more convenient place, but for which we must not forget to give Mr. Herbert full credit, that though Druidism is described as having been more or less prevalent in every part of Gaul, —Marseilles and Toulouse in the south, and Rheims in the north-east, being its chief strongholds,—the megalithic works which modern learning has pronounced Druidic are to be found only in one north-western province, inhabited by what Sidonius Apollinaris (quoted by Mr. Herbert, p. 27) calls the 'Britons beyond the Loire,' and the seat, after the revolution of 408, of the independent Armorican republic.

‘to destroy the high places and cut down the groves.’ Tacitus expressly tells us ‘that the groves sacred to cruel superstitions were cut down:’ but says not a word about the destruction, still less of the existence of temples, or other monuments, in any way answering to what, in these days, we call exclusively Druidical. Even the materials of which they were composed might offer a temptation (supposing there had been no other) too strong to be resisted by an active nation of improvers, who could feel no interest in such remains. Here were abundant quarries for the construction of roads, fortifications, or other works, to which their attention was turned. Yet when Aubrey visited Abury in the reign of Charles II., it was almost perfect, and Sir R. Hoare gives a catalogue of those ‘Goths’ who had carried on the work of destruction there between his own time and that of Dr. Stukeley. Of Stonehenge our own eyes can testify the completeness, if we except only the marks of age and the footprints of the elements.

Such objections, Mr. Herbert thinks, and with much show of reason, to be at once fatal to the Druidic character and the ante-Roman existence of these monuments. Others, who seem to have felt the weight of such evidence, have not put forward their doubts in so distinct a shape. Dr. Lingard, in his remarks upon the Druid religion, says, ‘I have not noticed the circles of unhewn stones, the remains of which still exist at Stonehenge, Abury, &c., because I do not find such stones mentioned by ancient writers as appendages to places of worship among the Celts.’ (Chap. i. n. 32.) For he, like all the rest, shrank from conclusions to which their doubts would have led them. Mr. Turner inclines, though coldly, to the Phœnician theory. The difficulty that strikes every thoughtful writer, without question, is to fix a satisfactory date for these monuments. One is too remote, another too modern. Besides those we have mentioned, the Celts, Belgæ, Saxons, and Danes, have in turn enjoyed the honour of being the founders. Mr. Wilson, in his ‘Prehistoric Remains in Scotland,’ decides for a still more ancient origin, finding in them and works cognate to them the traces of an ‘Allophylia’ people, as prior in time to, as different in nature from, the earliest Celts. Even an antediluvian origin has met with its partisans. All, or most, of these would have made them to the Druids and Romans, what they are to us, obsolete and inexplicable.

But do not such various and contrary opinions indicate, Mr. Herbert says, ‘an attempt to break away from convictions that press upon us.’ An attempt, he adds, which is in great measure prompted and enforced by the ‘prepossession’ in men’s minds that the effects of Christianity would have been

adverse to the erection of such edifices for religious purposes, if we assign them to a period during which the Church exercised any influence in these islands. This 'prepossession' he declares to be unfounded, contending, from the evidence we possess, that the Church had but little authority, or indeed inclination, to use its influence adverse to the bias of the times. (P. 36.) Besides, we may hazard the conjecture (which is not new) that they were not intended as exclusively religious edifices; which, if true, would have prevented Christianity from having more than a nominal influence in the matter.

Having thus disposed of his predecessors' labours, let us see what Mr. Herbert sets up in their place. He has, by the title of his book, as also by his remarks on the mistaken connexion between a rude style and antiquity, which we have above quoted, prepared us in some measure to learn that his 'Cyclops' was a modern, and even partially a Christian. Be this as it may, we shall content ourselves with examining, at present, his theory of the 'reduced antiquity' of these works, which is ingenious, and, we hope we shall be able to show, intelligible. He claims for them a distinct and prominent position in the history of our country, representing them as forming a part of a grand national purpose. The date which he assigns to them is the fifth century of the Christian era, and for the illustration of his doctrine he draws our attention to many extraordinary and special features of this age. But we must not expect to find that he has opened a new mine of information. With all his authorities others have been familiar, but have rejected them. No one before him thought of giving any weight to the narrative of Geoffrey of Monmouth, the Latin translator of Tysilio's 'Chronicle of Kings.' In their contempt for monkish tradition, historians have no doubt neglected many sources of valuable instruction.

Mr. Herbert, however, does not repudiate a fact because it is mixed with falsehood, or turn from his inquiry because explicit statements are not made ready to his hands. He is convinced that history has not been altogether silent upon this subject, if we rightly interpret her pages,—in short, that all, or most, of what we have hitherto been taught to believe, has been invented, 'not in defect of tradition, but in contradiction of all substantial historic fact.' To the guidance of such a pilot, therefore, for a time we cheerfully commit our vessel. We shall not, however, blindly follow in his track, without satisfying ourselves of the depths over which he carries us. But our soundings will not be from mistrust of his experience or skill, so much as from a desire to verify the correctness of the chart which he has given over this dark and untried passage.

Taking, then, the fifth century after Christ as the probable

date, let us see what there is on record to corroborate our author's hypothesis.

Sir James Mackintosh sets great value upon the native legends and songs of a people. Niebuhr, Arnold, and Macaulay, from the half-uttered echoes of Rome's antiquity, picture many of the opening scenes of her drama. Mr. Herbert assigns the like importance to the poetry of Britain, as not less genuine because sometimes tinged with the extravagance of monkish fable. The collection of legends in the 'Triads' is well known. The majority of these are of Bardic date, composed by the Bards, who, with the Britons, had fled from the Saxon yoke to an exile among the Welsh mountains, and who were then what their ancestors, the Druids, had been, the sole depositaries of the traditional lore of their nation. Our author's study of this collection enables him to state, that, of those few legends which bear the marks of an ante-Roman age, (such as the absence of Latin names,) and which are, therefore, in strictness, alone *Druidic*, none contain any mention of the 'Great Cor,' or 'Circle of Emmrys,' as Stonehenge is called in the native poetry; or of the name of Merlin, to whose potent spells that mighty work has been vulgarly attributed. On the other hand, the lays of the post-Roman era abound in allusions, under a variety of names, to the achievement of great national works which no antiquary has hitherto hesitated to identify with those under our consideration. Such are 'the raising of the stone of Ceti, 'the building of the work of Emmrys, and the heaping of the 'pile of Cyvangron' (p. 35). This important distinction seems to have been lost sight of by previous writers, from their not having noticed the various style of these compositions.

Besides, throughout the latter series the Bards speak, not as men reverting to times long gone by, but as if the pride and power from which they had fallen, and of which these temples were the sad monuments, were but a yesterday's loss, bewailing them with all the freshness of the Trojan exile's mourning, *Quæque ipse miserima vidi et quorum pars magna fui*.

Such evidence Mr. Herbert thinks conclusive, as far as it goes, for the recency of those objects which are thus regarded—a recency which at once contradicts the notion of an ante-Druidic existence, which latter, after what has been said, is perhaps the greatest obstacle we have to get over. With the love which these minstrels testify for their religion and its shrines, to suppose that they would 'go and nestle like owls in the forgotten 'ruins of an untold antiquity, claim them as pertaining to their 'own era, and make them the Sion of their harps,' our author justly thinks 'an incredibility' (p. 36).

But besides the testimony of the legends, he has on his side

the professed native historians, the authors of the various 'Bruts,' or Chronicles. We give his general comments on the value of their evidence in his own language :—

'The native authors' [says he] 'declared that the Great Cor was constructed in the latter days of Britannia, after the Roman emperors had ceased to govern her. They did not draw that conclusion from any reasonings or etymologies; for they neither used any such, nor had any pretensions to the capacity of so doing. It is assertion, not inference. They merely stated it because they were told it; and I will add, they were told it because it was so. The traditions of mankind are *primâ facie* true; though obvious motives may raise the presumption of their being in part or even totally false. National vanity is one such motive; and therefore the origin of traditions which magnify the antiquity of national greatness is to be regarded with suspicion and frequent incredulity. Such, for instance, would have been the case had the same authorities assured us that Gomer, son of Japhet, lay buried under these stones. The spirit of exaggerating antiquity was not one from which the Cambro-Britons were exempt; and it is strongly apparent in these very chronicles of Brutus the Trojan and his lineage. Why should not their giant Cors have been sanctified with antiquity as well as all other modes of honour, and have been made the glorious work of Brute, Locrine, or Beli Mawr?'—*Cyclops*, p. 35.

Yet, instead of reading the names of Gomer, Brutus, Hercules, or even King Arthur, in connexion with these works, we here meet with a plain tradition which assigns the 'Great Cor' to the 'latest period of the British nation's existence east of Severn,' and showing that they had scarcely piled up these giant stones 'when they were expelled (by the Saxon) for ever from the 'lands of their forefathers,' and their religion a second time exiled into the wilds and mountains; an admission, Mr. Herbert exclaims, directly opposed to their national vanity, 'humiliating to their nation and its antiquities, and at variance with all 'imaginable motives for falsehood.'

Of all the native chronicles, the 'Brut' of Kings by Tysilio is the most conspicuous for its absurdly fabulous and 'Trojanistic' spirit. Yet affording, as it does, so many proofs of its author's hardy contempt for the trammels of historic truth, and with every disposition in him to the contrary, it contains the plain statement that Stonehenge was erected posterior to the Roman age. The collateral points of the story are palpably fabulous, and the motives, as we shall hereafter show, dissimulative; but the fact remains broadly and undeniably asserted.

His account of it is the following :—That the site of Stonehenge was the scene of the murder and burial of those British chieftains who were slain by Hengest the Saxon, when they had assembled, on the occasion of the festival of the Calanmai, to celebrate the good feeling between the two nations; and that the Bard Merlin afterwards advised the reigning king Emmrys, or Ambrosius, to remove the Giant's Circle from Ireland, and

set it up as a monument over their graves. ('Cyclops,' p. 34.)

Thus much for Mr. Herbert's evidence, with which, as we have said, many, doubtless, have been long as familiar as he; but they feared or failed to draw the conclusion to which it would seem to point. But the great feature of our author's hypothesis is the new light which its development throws upon a long darkened page in our country's annals. We will endeavour to follow our guide as closely as our limits will allow.

It is the fashion amongst historians to represent the weakness of Rome as the *sole* cause of the separation of Britain from the empire under whose dominion she had acquired so much importance, and enjoyed so much prosperity. They suppose that she was left suddenly defenceless, and that, as suddenly, her degenerate sons fell before their hardier foes, the barbarians. But was it so in fact? Was it not rather from her conscious strength, and by her own act, that, in 408, she threw off the conqueror's yoke, and assumed an independent position, so important as to be acknowledged by the Emperor Honorius? We are inclined to believe the only pretence for the above opinion is, that about this period (but before the Roman fall, as well as after it) we, for the first time since the days of Agricola, hear of our island being desolated by barbarian invasion. Yet strong as is the language of Gildas, when describing the invasions of the Scots and Picts, Mr. Herbert thinks that its strictest acceptance will hardly carry their ravages lower than the Latin town of Eboracum, in either of the great inroads previous to the year 446; the chief contests being confined to the northern districts. No towns are said to have been taken, except such fortresses as were connected with the frontier wall, *relictis civitatibus muroque celso*. (P. 74.) Besides, it is fair that Mr. Herbert's opinion should be tried by the event; and we have a right to assume that, had Britain been so weak, the ravages by land would have been extended, and the maritime descents from other countries more frequent; for, as an island, she was peculiarly exposed; and the absence of her late experienced leaders, and the necessarily divided state of her government, would have rendered her an easy prey. Why did not the vast forests of Scandinavia and Germany, now long charged with overflowing multitudes, pour their thousands upon her inviting shores? We may surely infer that we have not the whole truth here; for it is evident that the new state must, considering all its confessed disadvantages, have possessed in itself a means of resistance beyond what we have generally given it credit for, when we find it without a decisive invasion for more than forty years; and even then the foe gained a footing only by invitation from within; while the

final subjugation of the island was deferred for more than a century. No man can deliberately assume that the scanty contingents occasionally sent from Gaul on the urgent demand of the 'groaning Britons,' could do more than they are related to have done; that is, have repaired the ruined wall and repulsed the frontier enemy: they could not have protracted the conquest of a people who were ripe to be conquered.

Mr. Herbert thinks the true account of this phenomenon is to be sought in the nation themselves. He suggests that there had arisen in Britain a great moral convulsion, which, for a time, fused the differences of race and faith under the stronger heat of some all-powerful influence. 'The revolt of the insular and 'Armorican Britannias in 408,' he afterwards remarks, 'was an unique event, curious in its nature, and locally, at least, momentous The rest of the empire crumbled away by the conquering inroads of the foreigner. But here a conquest of the early Cæsars was restored to (and we may add, for a time, at least, maintained by) the mixed race of its ancient inhabitants and Roman colonists.' (P. 217.)

Religious zeal is one such all-powerful motive. Let us see if this will apply to the case before us. There can be little doubt, he thinks, that the revolution was mainly a religious one, or, rather, that circumstances which, on the failure of the sedition of Maximus and his death, had rendered the overthrow of the Roman power a feasible as well as a desirable object, opened the way under his son Eugenius, (called 'Owen Finddu' in the Triads), and the auspices of the fanatic mother of the latter,—a British 'Helena'—to the re-establishment of the old native superstition. The parties in the field were the remnants of the Druidic body, existing hitherto beyond the Roman pale, small in numbers and weakened by the persecution of more than four centuries, but strong in the prestige of an ancient title, and elated by the weakness of their bitterest foes. On the other hand, the Christians, though perhaps superior in numbers, had been of late weakened by division and heresy, particularly that of Pelagius, and had besides lost the support which the liberal state-religion of Rome had afforded them. Both were anxious to assert and extend their faith. It was not for the interest of either to maintain a contest of intolerance between themselves, which must expose both to the attacks of the vast force of Paganism which lay beyond and around them. Is it improbable that there might have been a compromise between them (with all due submission we advance such a topic), in the first place, intended as an extraordinary remedy, and suggested by common danger and national sympathy—one, too, which seemed feasible without great sacrifice of principle on either side, though the

ulterior results may have proved untoward? On the side of the Church we cannot imagine there would have been much difficulty. Its proselytising spirit and ready adoption of national prejudices is a fact above the necessity of proof. The compromise, which, as we believe, would have been the result of the Judaizing tendencies of some even of the apostles, had it not been denounced and overborne by the fearless character of S. Paul, had been attempted, we know, at a later time, and with fatal success, in the case of the Gnostics in the East, and Platonists in Egypt, and so it was, we may suppose, in Britain.

It must be always borne in mind that we are now only endeavouring to interpret our author's conjectures. He frankly confesses that the whole period is a blank in every annalist. 'It is manifest,' he remarks, 'that British history has been completely falsified in its chronicles, and that another and more true history was formerly known, which a Nennius and a Tysilio did not think good for our edification, and of which the memory is now lost.' (*Britannia after the Romans*, p. 35.) His theory, therefore, at present, rests on such bare gleanings of evidence as his industry has collected. More than this could not be said of much that Niebuhr wrote. It will be for further research to determine the measure of our faith, or the extent of our adhesion.

The chief points of historical evidence to which Mr. Herbert refers for a confirmation of this, his view, are the following:— 'It is almost the precise time,' he says, 'of Britain's separation from the Empire that the paschal schism is said to have arisen there upon the suggestion of Sulpicius Severus. See *S. Adhelm Epist. ad Gerontium*, and *Usher, Index Chron. in anno 410*, p. 219.' We have it on record that the British Church up to the time of Constantine had, in conformity with the Nicene decree, celebrated Easter on the 16th day of the month, corresponding in a cycle of 84 years to the Jewish Nisan; (*Epist. of Const. Ad omnes Ecclesias*, *Spelman. Conc.* p. 45, quoted by Mr. Herbert, *Brit. after the Romans*, p. 42;) while at a later period we find its members incurring the charge of heresy as *Quartodecimans*, for adopting the Jewish celebration on the 14th day. If this change had occurred under the Roman system, we should have found it alluded to in historical or theological writers. Mr. Herbert therefore assigns it to the days of confusion and dismemberment contemporary with Sulpicius, and quotes the authority of Archbishop Usher. (*Brit. Eccl.* p. 483, *ed.* 1687.) That prelate refers the advice of Sulpicius in this matter to a desire of obtaining a medium between the discordant computes of Alexandria and Rome. From this Mr. Herbert dissents, but it matters little to us what was the object. The fact of Britain's separation from

the Latin communion before, and independently of, the Saxon conquest, is all we have to do with, and that he thinks indisputable.

Gildas, an authority certainly not in general favourable to our author's views, expressly mentions the deplorable apostasy of the Britons during the years succeeding their revolt from Rome. His words, 'Non gentium diis perspicue litant,' are not without a very remarkable meaning in the mouth of a sincere Churchman though bigoted historian.

An important corroboration of the above view is to be found in Mr. Herbert's construction of the 'Apology of Bacharius,' published in Muratori's *Anecd. Bibl. Ambrosiana*, and quoted in *Brit. after the Romans*, p. 117. This extraordinary document is an apology purporting to be addressed to the Apostolic See by a man who, coming forth, like Abraham from among the Chaldees, from a nation whose reputation for heresy and sin was only too well known, feels it necessary to vindicate himself from the leprous taint which common opinion supposed him to have contracted. Strange to say, the writer never breathes the name of his country! Africa and Spain have been mentioned as the probable scenes of Bacharius' strictures. But in the former, Mr. Herbert argues, heresy was (if at all) prevalent only among the descendants of the Vandal conquerors, the main body of the population being, as is well known, sincerely attached to the true faith: while in Spain, the voice of Priscillianism had been twice lately hushed by the assembled Church of the nation, so that no Spaniard *could* have spoken of his country as Bacharius does. Mr. Herbert cannot discover any other nation deserving at that time such sweeping reproach besides our own. In confirmation of this view, constant positive tradition identifies Bacharius with an illustrious member of the insular Church, Mochta the Briton. The exact date of this apology is not determined, but in another work, written by him in 460, Bacharius describes himself as then an old man.

By way of illustrating the nature of the national heresy, we may add that as late as the year 1102, in the archiepiscopate of Anselm, we read, among the minutes of two successive Councils of London, a decree directed against the worship of fountains, 'and especial mention made of two where the practice condemned had chiefly prevailed.' Dr. Henry remarking on these passages says, though without giving authority, that such a practice was held to have been a relic of *Druidic superstition*. B. III. c. ii. s. 3.

Lastly, we have proof *a posteriori* that *something*, be it what it may, had suddenly changed the aspect as well as the fortunes of our island. She, who had been the favoured province of Constantine, Theodosius and Maximus, within a few years of the

Roman overthrow sinks into gloom and oblivion, and 'seems,' says Mr. Herbert, 'to have returned into the bosom of that *'ultra-mundane Oceanus* in which she had lain, "quite divided 'from the whole world," until the arms of Claudius dragged her 'into Europe.' (*Brit. after the Romans*, p. 143.) For many years we are chiefly indebted to the mention, in foreign authors, of the British colony in Armorica, that the name of *Briton* meets our ear. The voice of history having ceased, the British isles become the privileged region of fable; and in one legend they are, what the Cimmerian Chersonese was to the ancients—a Hades on earth—to which the souls of the dead were ferried over sea by unseen boatmen; while in another they are described as abandoned to the range of fierce and poisonous beasts. (Cf. *Procopius* with *Tzetzes' Comm. on Lycophron*, quoted by Mr. Herbert, *Brit. after the Romans*, p. 143.)

We have digressed thus far in order to do full justice to what must be considered as the key of our author's position, viz. the convulsion of national feeling in Britain after the revolt from Rome, which convulsion he endeavours to show was connected with, if not greatly dependent on, an attempt to restore the old Druidic system, to which the Church, too weak to resist, submitted on terms of compromise. Mr. Herbert has, we believe, discussed this question, and the general features of the age to which it belongs, at length in his 'Essay on the Neo-Druidic heresy,' but we carefully avoid entering on such a topic in our present 'connexion.' Those, who are curious on this subject, must be content to search for themselves in those books we have already quoted. We shall delay no more in speculating on details where our information must necessarily be scarce, and the ground somewhat delicate. We must leave it to our readers to determine whether or not our author has in his 'pleadings' stated a sufficiently colourable case, as to the date and causes of the works in question.

Dr. Robertson, noticing some of the excesses consequent on the eager adoption of the Reformed doctrines by the vulgar, remarks that we who live at such a distance of time can hardly realise the effects which a new fanaticism would, under such circumstances, be likely to produce. If Mr. Herbert's historical deductions be just, he may well call upon us to consider ere we condemn his theory,—remembering (in spite of Mr. Smee) that there are as yet no laws discovered to which the human will or heart are amenable, especially in an age of strange and striking combinations, of intense religious zeal, shameless dissimulation, and recklessness of means, which overbore all opposition, silenced or excluded waverers, and bonded together the votaries in an union of almost mystical strength. An age distinguished by such features is sure to mark its era in history by mighty monuments.

The enthusiasm of Mahomet carried his followers to distant conquest; in Britain a similar spirit may have led the nation to erect those fierce and stupendous memorials which have alike puzzled antiquaries and philosophers.

The duration of this extraordinary age Mr. Herbert extends from the year of freedom, in 408, to the final triumph of the Saxons about the year 550. He finds united in this 'era of splendour and sin,' to use his own graphic language, 'nearly all the possible requisites for his proposition,—an advanced state of human science'—the great bequest of the departed Roman—'considerable resources existing in the country, the independent use of them, and a public mind of great and energetic aberration.' (P. 75.) This latter quality, he thinks, will account for 'the means of performance and the motives of it'—our greatest moral difficulties—as well as for the specific style and character which the works assumed. For where, argues he, a certain style of architecture wants the *indicia* belonging to a progressive course of art, where it does not hinge upon inventions improving the capacity, but upon motives 'actuating the will,' there we must be prepared to find that an extraordinary cause will produce an extraordinary effect. This would appear to be eminently so in the case before us—that of a 'fanatical and enthusiastic people, constructing a new policy after ages of dependence, and a new religion out of two old ones.' 'From whom that people borrowed their idea, what moved them to adopt such a style in preference to others easier and more elegant, and how old it was among those from whom they borrowed?' these, Mr. Herbert confesses to be 'questions more or less difficult.' We quote his own words as furnishing an attempted interpretation of the difficulty.

'The entire (megalithic) system,' he remarks, 'as it was introduced among the Britons in the last days of the Western Empire, perhaps never existed anywhere else, even in regard of the forms which it assumed, but much less in regard of the feelings with which it was connected. There was this difference, that elsewhere it exhibited the natural materials and rude fashion of a real simplicity, whereas here (in Britain) it exhibits the deliberate choice and fanatical zeal of a people more advanced in civility.' (P. 233.) From whatever quarter it travelled to our shores—and it is very likely connected with the North Western migrations (for in their wake alone can anything cognate to it be found),—it is certain that those nations possessed only the rudiments of what the Britons under the high pressure of their enthusiastic spirit carried much further.

To his second question the best answer we can make is simply to refer to the history. Under the circumstances of so great a revolution as that which we have above supposed, it was not

likely that men would be satisfied without a visible and striking image of their new common faith. 'Let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven,' was the general cry of those who, in the pride of their new state, feared the time when they might be 'scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.' The demand for the marvellous and gigantic was not to be contented with any existing form, whether Christian or Druidic, but by common consent they adopted one they found traditionally connected with the family of nations to which the mass of the people belonged. Here, Mr. Herbert thinks, we may trace the Druid, or rather Bardic, influence. At so small a sacrifice did they in great measure restore the supremacy of their order,—the substitution of stones for trees—the lasting material for the perishable,—and of the solitude of the plain for the silent gloom of the forest! At the distance of eleven centuries, as Aubrey gazed upon the unbroken avenues of stones, they offered to his eyes as forcible an image as ever of the grove which, (as suggested,) they were designed to represent; while, in confirmation of such a theory, tradition and prejudice have to this day stamped such works as exclusively Druidical.

The adoption of such a style of architecture was eminently fitted for the other uses to which the supposed new constitution will have intended to devote those mighty 'Babels.' We have before alluded to the possibility of their being of a mixed sacred and political character. Hitherto with the old priesthood of Britain and Gaul, as in Egypt and India, religious faith had been rather a matter of philosophic teaching, unexplained and unappreciated by the vulgar. The fashion of Christianity had rendered the publicity and popularity of a creed a necessary condition of its existence, and the advantage of combining civil with religious institutions had been duly felt and approved. Hence, in the Neo-Druidic period, the central seat of national worship became, as in ancient Greece, the 'Panionium' of the British name, community of faith being here as there interpreted as the surest earnest of community of interest. Stonehenge (whatever may have been the use of Abury) was, from its situation, admirably adapted for such a twofold purpose. And it may be as Mr. Herbert suggests, that the seat of civil government was transferred to Ambri, or Ambresbury, (now Amesbury,) hard by, for such a reason. The 'Head of Bran,'—the mystical type of the kingdom—was said to have been concealed at 'Caer Caradoc,' which a Welsh writer (quoted, 'Cyclops,' p. 221,) expressly calls the 'Mount of Ambri.' Geoffrey of Monmouth explains it as 'Salisbury,' by a vulgar error confusing everything on Salisbury Plain with Sarum. Hence the 'Great Cor' is, on the one hand, 'the great circle

'of dominion' (we quote the language of the legends), 'the central place of precious stones,' figurative expressions, which obviously describe it as the national assembly; while the name Mynydd Dewis, 'Mount of Election,' would seem to point to it as the 'Scone' of the British kings, where those creatures of the priesthood were anointed by the Bardic hierarchy, and perhaps the surrounding barrows mark their places of sepulture. Among the poetic expressions which shadow forth its religious character, we find such as the 'walls of the Eternal, the melodious quaternity of Peter' (the rock or stone of the Church, as Mr. Herbert interprets it, p. 88). What have we here but an embodiment of the combined majesty of Church and State? We now see a structure which does not dishonour so grand an aim, and discern a purpose worthy to be recorded by so stupendous a monument!

We may naturally feel curious, after following our author in his present ingenious attempt at the restoration of historic truth, to learn what he has to tell us of the previous mutilation of the building, and why it is that such scanty fragments present themselves to the antiquary's notice. The experienced reader need not be told that such a case is probably only one among many, where truth has been obscured by the passions and prejudices of mankind. Look at comparatively modern times—the Cathedral of Cologne dates from no earlier period than the wane of the Middle Ages; yet, though our interest has been excited to the utmost in its behalf, we, as yet, know no more of its early history than ignorance, superstition, or dissimulation will vouchsafe to us. The motives, however, for the concealment of the real history of Britain during the fifth century may at least be guessed at, and the examination of such of them as bear upon our subject, will form, we hope, no inappropriate conclusion to our present remarks.

Mr. Herbert has shown how Britain's birthday of independence was celebrated by a vigorous attempt at self-government and self-defence, and how in their desire of temporary union, the leaders of the movement showed themselves designedly careless of the means by which an end was attained. That a calamitous termination should ere long crown so time-serving a policy may be easily conceived. Fanatical zeal for the hour covered, but could not exclude, schism and discord. The nation, awakening from its delirium, was a house divided against itself, and fell under the curse incident to such a condition. The declamatory style of Gildas may, after all, contain no great exaggeration of the miseries that ensued. We read there of folly, extravagance, depravity, and apostasy; of the antagonism between a proud priesthood, and weak, but haughty monarchs, descendants of Caractacus and Boadicea; while barbarian inva-

ders, incessantly hovering on the frontier, wearied out all the efforts of a divided and oppressed people. Then the ever-fatal device of matching one foe against another introduced the Saxon to devour the now easy prey. These were truths too bitter to find a ready chronicler. Besides, the days of heathenism and darkness which followed destroyed the means (had even the wish existed) of commemorating the national ruin. Hence, except by tradition, the truth was scarce remembered. But it was reserved to a far later age to interpolate a positive falsehood in its place. Such an attempt was made by Tysilio, in his 'Chronicle of Kings,' published some time in the eighth century. The short account there given of the 'Cor Emmrys,' and which we have quoted, affords a forcible instance of what Mr. Herbert calls 'dissimulation' in a historian,—namely, that he clothes his facts with so much falsehood as to create a suspicion of the facts themselves. He could not conceal the truth that the site of Stonehenge was the scene of the well-known tragedy of the bloody 'Calanmai,'—that event had made the 'Great Cor' a subject of too painful interest for a historian to pass it in silence, as he has Abury, or to assign to it a mere fabulous origin. Forced to give thus much truth, he atones for the confession by describing it as a recent monument¹ erected after the Saxon Conquest by piety and patriotism to the fallen flower of British valour;—affecting to be ignorant that it had, in fact, existed long before as the temple of false religion, and that those who had perished there were not devoted leaders, but men who, for their own selfish ends, and by their fanatical policy and teaching, had brought the nation to disunion, defeat, and exile. Everything conspired to assist in establishing the ingenious fraud. The name under which the place was known by the Britons was entirely forgotten, or carefully concealed, with the memory of their disgrace, while one which the Saxon² had given to the monument in his hour of triumph—a name derived from that of his successful leader—survived and continued, and was adopted by Tysilio and Geoffrey, the Latin translator of the 'Brut,' the latter being perhaps ignorant of the true etymology, or, what is more likely, as Mr. Herbert remarks, reading it as 'Hanging Stones.' Of course in Saxon

¹ 'It existed when that event occurred,' says Mr. Herbert, 'of which it is feigned to be a memorial, although it became, as it were, a monument to those who were there buried. So the church of Ste. Genevieve has been made, though it was not built, a mausoleum; and special motives have operated to banish from discourse, and partly from recollection, its original character. This may serve for imperfect illustration.'—P. 85.

² The advocates of the Druidic theory seem not to have considered that there is any inconsistency between the character of the people to whom they ascribe the erection of these stones, and the name which they bear. For that is evidently Saxon; and a passage in Dugdale, where the reading is 'Stanhengest,' confirms Mr. Herbert's interpretation of 'Stones of Hengest.'

England nothing but the Saxon appellation prevailed, and thus the misnomer and the falsehood have passed down the stream of history. But Mr. Herbert, learned in the poetry of Wales, the native land of his house, brings to bear upon the false teaching of the 'Brut' the indignant refutation of the later Bards. These fierce enthusiasts, whose sons and grandsons knew so well how to fire the patriotism of their countrymen against the yoke of the 'ruthless' Edward, could not, without equal disdain, brook the faint-heartedness of those who, to conceal the memorials of defeat, introduced a lie upon their annals, and obscured the 'storied' monument of the high deeds and proud bearing of their order during its second sway, after the fall of the 'men of Cæsar.' Cynddelw, the arch-Bard of Powys, at the close of the twelfth century, thus vented his detestation of Tysilio and his school:

'A copious bard sings sweetly your praise,—
A song without separation (i.e. schism), without deception;
A lofty song, without quietness, without silence;
Not the detested song of the followers of Tysilio.'—(P. 42.)

We must conclude. We cannot but feel that we have still left much unnoticed in our author's treatise; but our desire to confine ourselves to the most popular view of his subject must be our excuse. Thus we have neglected the megalithic system, as it appears in the Gallic province on the other side the Channel; a study of which would suggest a much closer connexion between the *uterque Britannus* than historians have hitherto remarked. We have passed over, too, Mr. Herbert's onslaught upon the mighty fallacy of the 'Dracontian Temples,'—the pet discovery of Dr. Stukeley,—and which many succeeding antiquaries have taken without a murmur—and, apropos of that, the dishonesty and oftentimes the ignorance of that learned Doctor. All which are 'mighty interesting,' as old Pepys would say, and may reward the patient reader. It is a fault inherent, perhaps, in the nature of Mr. Herbert's work, that on many points, even relating to his immediate subject, it is rather suggestive than conclusive; and this has necessarily led to a want of arrangement which has, we are bound to say, added much to our present task of interpretation. Further, in all that he has advanced we are not inclined to concur; but we repeat that the desire to do justice to the stride here made in antiquarianism has led us thus far to follow his guidance. And we think that, all things considered, we shall have no longer need to blush for our countrymen in their treatment of subjects like the present, when, in answer to the oft-repeated question, 'What mean these stones?' we point to this production, and compare it with the models of learning and patient labour of our German neighbours.

ART. II.—*The History of Mary Queen of Scots.* By F. A. MIGNET. 2 vols. London: Bentley.

AMONGST all the modes of settling a dispute, and satisfying the earnest longing for justice which disturbs the heart of man, perhaps the old method, by single combat, presents most points of immediate satisfaction. There is something so entirely congenial to the feelings in seeing a cause personified, and adequately represented. Much of this present satisfaction is experienced when we find in the page of history some grand struggle maintained, some vital question worked out, by men alive to their responsibilities, equal to the important interests they support, and with minds and tempers akin to the principles they advocate. Such a combat and such champions we find in the period we are now called on to consider—a period not less remarkable for the mighty interests involved in the battle then fought out, than for the personal qualities of those engaged in it, and their singular adaptation to the parts they severally played. It may be said, indeed, that circumstances have the power of moulding characters and fitting them to the form assigned them, but the adaptation here is something much more particular and appropriate. Had any of the leading characters in this drama changed places, we see that the results might have been altogether different, and these differences of such magnitude, as to alter the whole face of society abroad and at home, even down to the present day.

The course of events connected with the unhappy queen whose character is the subject of our article, by turns brings before us all the principal personages of that period; around her they often group themselves, and with her all were intimately concerned; so closely, indeed, that the contact always develops their inner nature, unmasks their designs and motives, and tests and tries them, as some great power of nature tests every substance that is brought within its influence. It is a test popularly considered fatal to the magnanimity of our great Elizabeth, and to the disinterestedness of Scotland's great statesman: a test to bring out in glaring relief all the fierceness of Knox's nature; to reveal the secret sources of France's duplicity; and the cruelty, the treachery, the ambition of Spain; and to make manifest the utter corruption which lay on the surface at least of the old religion, and to expose every failure of sincerity, reverence, and charity, in that form which superseded it. False herself, Mary of Scotland is yet the mirror of

truth to those who approach her; we see in every instance the bad in blacker colours, and the pure gold of the best sullied by an alloy, which need not have been detected, but for the severe trial she brings them to.

The fair, candid, impartial mind finds in the records of Mary and her times lessons of such rare interest and importance, such a far and clear insight into persons, motives, and the secret springs of great events, as will repay the toils of the most laborious search. But for any real good, for the ascertaining of truth, for fulfilling any of the uses and purposes of history, candour and impartiality are so important, are indispensable in so stringent a sense of the term, that we may say it is better not to study them at all, than to do so in any other spirit; and experience shows us how hard it is for those who bring themselves within reach of Mary's fascinations, to preserve these qualities. For her beauty lives still: three hundred years have passed, and her smiles and tears have yet power to move the heart, and to pervert the judgment. Those well-known features reign over the imagination as though we beheld them with our eyes; we look in her face and forget, not only all that can be said, but, alas! all that can be proved, against her. If this be so now, it was surely a happy thing for England that while all this beauty lived and breathed, our country lay under a woman's rule. Most unfortunate Mary must have deemed it. No king could have withstood the temptation once to behold those charms, no man could have resisted their influence. What would have been the end, who can tell? Had she once came a suppliant before him, the world might have seen the ancient tale realized—

‘In robe and crown the king came down
To meet and greet her on her way;
“It is no wonder,” said the lords,
“She is more beautiful than day.”’

And so she might have slid into the unguarded throne, which she never abandoned the hope of one day possessing. Even Elizabeth seems to have known that her safety lay in distance, that it was risking too much to indulge a natural curiosity. We can hardly, indeed, overrate what might have been Mary's living power under favouring circumstances, when we see to what an extent her fascinations blind the moral sense of her historians and apologists at this distant period of time; when we note the tender names they give to her errors, what efforts they make to elude them, how shrinkingly they approach the mention of them, how hastily they pass them over, how petulantly unjust it renders them to all beside, applying all the severer moral standard to her fellow-actors for the licence they allow themselves in her solitary exceptional case.

M. Mignet, her latest biographer, and whose work, ably condensing as it does much new matter, has given the subject a fresh interest, is better described as Mary's admirer than her apologist; for having a taste, and, we must believe also, a tender conscience, for historic accuracy, there is no want of fairness to complain of in his detail of the facts of his heroine's story; her worst enemy (the epithet invariably applied to every conscientious believer in Mary's guilt in the one great transaction of her life) never brought together so great a weight of evidence against her. In fact, he believes all the bad she has ever been charged with. The remarkable point in M. Mignet is, that this conviction of guilt in no way seems to affect his feelings towards her. She still occupies in his mind the niche of injured innocence and virtue. Now and then, it is true, the urgency of the case drags from him some unwilling phrases of condemnation; but the *tone* of his work is sympathising admiration. We know not what may be the secret cause for this perverted judgment. Whether it is to be found in his pride, as a Frenchman, in Mary's beauty and grace, herself half a Frenchwoman by birth, and wholly by education; or whether it proceeds from an equally patriotic hatred of Elizabeth as a main author of our national greatness, it is not easy to decide; probably both these motives have their influence; certain it is that Elizabeth gets all the hard words, is the object of all the virtuous indignation our author has to bestow; and that the same faults which in Mary are passed over without comment, or even sometimes with a lofty tribute of praise to her talent, ingenuity, and matchless resources, are in Elizabeth denounced in a storm of righteous censure. The course of our narrative will afford sufficient proof of this, without lingering at the outset to substantiate our charge. We who are compelled, however ungalantly, to take Mignet's facts,—borne out as they are by every trustworthy previous history,—and to form our own severer conclusions upon them, must proceed, without further delay, to detail these facts as recent search has confirmed, and thrown new light upon them; first attempting to show that in spite of the elegance of Mary's education, and the apparent promise of her youth, there was nothing in her early training to render the darker pages of his history impossible, nor more uncongenial and unnatural than great crimes must always be, when we set ourselves deliberately, and in cool blood, to account for them.

Mary is universally called unfortunate and unhappy—too often, to screen her from severer and more appropriate epithets. But unhappy and unfortunate she may be truly called in the circumstances of her childhood and of her education. For what

greater mishap could have befallen a beautiful and innocent child, than to be taken from a mother's care to be reared in the bosom of the Court of France, under the eye and immediate superintendence of her uncle the Cardinal of Lorraine, the most infamous member of the house of Guise, and under the maternal care and example of her mother-in-law, Catharine of Medici, that type and byword of falsehood and cruel treachery? Of this court M. Mignet gives us the following picture:—

'This court was then the most magnificent, the most elegant, the most joyous, and, we must add, the most lax in Europe. Still retaining certain military customs of the middle ages, and at the same time conforming to the intellectual usages of the time of the *renaissance*, it was half-chivalric and half-literary, mingling tournaments with studies, hunting with erudition, mental achievements with bodily exercises, the ancient and rough games of skill and strength with the novel and delicate pleasures of the arts. Nothing could equal the splendour and vivacity which Francis I. had introduced into his court, by attracting thither all the principal nobility of France, by educating as pages therein young gentlemen of all the provinces, by adorning it with nearly two hundred ladies belonging to the greatest families in the kingdom, and by establishing it sometimes in the splendid palaces of Fontainebleau and S. Germain, which he had either built or beautified on the banks of the Seine, and sometimes in the spacious castles of Blois and Amboise, which his predecessors had inhabited on the banks of the Loire. A careful imitator of his father's example, Henry II. kept up the same magnificence at his court, which was presided over with as much grace as activity by the subtle Italian, Catherine de Medici, whose character had been formed by Francis I., who had admitted her into the *petite bande de ses dames favorites* with whom he used to hunt the stag, and frequently sport with alone in his pleasure-houses! The men were constantly in the company of the women; the queen and her ladies were present at all the games and amusements of Henri II. and his gentlemen, and accompanied them in the chase. The king, on his part, together with the noblemen of his retinue, used to pass several hours every morning and evening in the apartments of Catherine de Medici. "There," says Brantôme, "there was a host of human goddesses, some more beautiful than the others; every lord and gentleman conversed with her whom he loved best; whilst the king talked to the queen, his sister, the Dauphiness, (Mary Stuart,) and the princesses together with those lords and princes who were seated nearest him." As the kings themselves had avowed mistresses, they were desirous that their subjects should follow their example, "and if they did not do so," says Brantôme, "they considered them coxcombs and fools."—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 37.

It is of this court, and its influence upon the susceptible mind of childhood, that M. Mignet ventures to say, that Mary 'during this period only gained benefit from it,' (p. 40,) as if, because she was not old enough to take an active share in its immoralities, that therefore her moral sense was not infected by the atmosphere in which she lived. Whereas it was this union of elegance and polish with deep depravity which constituted its chief danger. She might under another aspect have learnt to view sin with horror and disgust; but in this gay domestic social scene

of wickedness, in which even religion was by no means shut out, and was universally acknowledged and respected, such a foundation of laxity and tolerance of evil was laid, as offers the readiest solution for all the subsequent errors of her life. Mary had infinite charms and graces, but there is hardly any indication of her possessing a conscience; as far as in them lay, those polished princes and cardinals strangled it in the cradle, to make her more like themselves, more the creature of their designs. Nothing is more fearful amongst these masters of dissimulation and profligacy, of which that bad court furnished so many examples, than the absence of remorse after their ill deeds are done. Less sinners show us a mind in torment, full of anguish, if not repentance, when the tempter abandons them to their fate; but these gigantic criminals, these wholesale plotters, and poisoners, and assassins, who filled the earth with their deeds of violence, seem to have been able to sustain their courage and their audacity to the end. No lifted veil reveals what should have been the terrors of Charles IX.'s last hours: he died calmly, his hand clasped in that of his mother Catharine. We might call it an exemplary end, but that there is no sign, no confession, not one symptom of repentance for one of the blackest crimes that disgrace our nature. And the reason for this must be that with them the very salt had lost its savour; their religion was corrupt, as being disconnected with purity of life. Party spirit, no less than self-indulgence, led to this fatal result. With many a grievous failing in Christian love and charity, the Reformers did yet preach morality; and because they did so, and had used the universal decay of it as a powerful weapon against the religion in power, therefore those in spiritual high places did too often only the more defy and disregard the moral precepts of the Gospel, only the more held monstrous transgressions of purity and truth as venial, because that opposite party sternly upheld them. And when Mary early learnt to abhor John Knox, and to reverence and to yield herself to the guidance of her profligate uncle, she learnt, alas! at the same time, to hate along with him the stern moral law which he preached. She learnt to form a wholly different standard of what constituted a faithful child of the Church; and in spite of the sins of her life, it does not seem that according to her own judgment she ever fell short of it.

The difficulties which exist against forming a correct and unanimous judgment on the character of this queen cannot certainly be attributed to a want of materials. No period of history was ever laid more bare, more completely exposed for absequent investigation; and this constantly in the very handwriting of the parties most concerned. What was scarcely

whispered three hundred years ago, is now proclaimed on the house-tops—plots and dark designs, which it would have been rack, and torture, and death to reveal then, all the world may now peruse in all the comfort of fair type and drawing-room security. The schemes against this nation in particular, what Mary wrote to Philip, and Philip wrote to the Pope, and all that the Pope replied, and all that Alva advised and projected, which would once have made the faint-hearted give up their country for lost, are now food for easy triumph or amused speculation. In addition to the innumerable histories and narratives contemporary, or composed at intervals for different ends down to the present current year, we are informed by Prince Labanoff that in our State-paper Office alone the letters and papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots, collected and classed with the greatest care in chronological order, amount to sixty-nine bound folio volumes. The archives of France and Spain also contribute their share of curious confirmation. Mary's own letters which have escaped to this time amount to 736, and in the midst of documents of little interest, formal announcements, demands for safe-conduct, and professions of friendship, which flowed so readily from Mary's pen, and meant so little, are some which reveal her very heart; letters written in the heat of passion, and with a startling force of expression which brings her whole soul before us—and many equally remarkable for dignity of remonstrance, for a clear terse statement of facts, and for readiness in turning those facts to her own advantage. At a time when most ladies could not write a letter at all; when they could neither spell the words, nor compose a sentence, nor knew how to use these accomplishments for the purpose of expressing their thoughts, had they possessed them, Mary was an accomplished letter-writer; the pen was her weapon,—her letters, as compositions, may stand a comparison with those of the wisest and greatest men of her time. She began to write early, and the melancholy circumstances of her life, and her own indomitable spirit and restless temper, kept her in continual practice. Writing was the occupation of her life.

We need not remind our readers that Mary, a 'beautiful infant' in her sixth year, accompanied by her 'four Maries,' the daughters of noble Scotch houses, of the same age and name as herself, after being affianced to the Dauphin, was committed by her mother, Mary of Lorraine and Queen Dowager of Scotland, to the care of her relations and the French king, to be educated in her adopted country till she was of age to complete the marriage contract:—a measure deemed necessary from the disturbed state of Scotland, and the constant attempts of each party to obtain possession of the person of the young queen.

In France she received an education fitted to develop every gift of nature.

'She early displayed the varied gifts of her rich and charming nature. At ten years of age she astonished all who knew her by her maturity, and wrote to the Queen Dowager with delicate and precocious good sense. When thirteen years old she recited a Latin speech of her own composition in presence of the King, the Queen, and the whole Court, in the hall of the Louvre.'—*Ibid.* p. 41.

And again:—

'Her mental and personal attractions were early developed. She was tall and beautiful; her eyes beamed with intelligence and sparkled with animation. She had the most elegantly shaped hands in the world. Her voice was sweet, her appearance noble and graceful, and her conversation brilliant. She early displayed those charms which were destined to make her an object of universal admiration, and which rendered even her infancy seductive. She had been brought up with the daughters of Catherine de Medici, and under the superintendence of the learned Margaret of France, the sister of Henry II.'—*Ibid.* p. 36.

She was educated with great care. She understood and spoke Latin with facility—she had considerable knowledge of history, knew several living languages, and we learn from Brantôme that she had a fine poetical taste.

'She loved poetry and poets; but, above all, M. de Ronsard, M. du Bellay, and M. de Maisonsieur, who have written beautiful verses and elegies on her. She herself composed and wrote verses, of which I have seen some beautiful and well written. She sang very well, accompanying herself on the lute, which she touched very prettily with that beautiful white hand of hers, and those fair well-shaped fingers.'—*Ibid.* p. 43.

Her uncle, the Cardinal, thus writes of her to his sister, the Queen Dowager of Scotland, when she had attained her tenth year:—

'After having assured you of the prosperity and health of the said lords, I will tell you those things which are most important to yourself, and from which you will receive most pleasure and satisfaction. It is, that the said lady, your daughter, is so grown, and indeed increases every day in height, goodness, beauty, wisdom, and virtues, that she is as perfect and accomplished in all things honest and virtuous as it is possible for her to be, and there is no one like her to be found, either among noble ladies or others, of what low or mean condition they may be. And I am constrained to tell you, Madame, that the King takes such a liking to her, that he often amuses himself in chatting with her for an hour at a time, and she knows as well how to entertain him with good and wise conversation as any woman of five-and-twenty would.'—*Labanoff*, vol. i. p. 9.

And going on to make arrangements with his sister for forming a separate establishment for her, suited to her rank, not being satisfied with the existing state of things:—

'I advise that there should be nothing superfluous in the order of it, nor yet mean or sordid, which is what she hates more than anything in the world. And believe me, Madame, she has already so high and noble a

courage, that she makes great demonstrations of being vexed, seeing herself in this inferior position, and for this reason desires to see herself removed from the present guardianship, and to live in authority.'

And at the end of the same letter:—

'As for me, Madame, all my happiness will lie in serving the mother and the daughter, and I will always attend to what it will please you to command me, and I hope so to manage that you shall be content. I only beg you, Madame, to believe me satisfied that never was a daughter calculated to give greater contentment, or better brought up; and I must not conceal from you that Madame de Parroys (her governess) does the best that it is possible to do, and be sure that God is well served, and after the old fashion. The bearer of this will tell you of the harangue which the queen, your daughter, made to the king.'—*Ibid.* p. 14.

Elsewhere he says:—

'I can assure you, Madame, that there is no one more beautiful and more virtuous than the Queen, your daughter; she governs both the King and the Queen.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 36.

It was probably unhappy for Mary's moral training that she was so charming and so teachable. Besides the importance for their own ends, which was the primary motive with her guardians, there was a positive pleasure in witnessing her aptitude for the part they designed her to play, and her quickness and docility in receiving their lessons: the earliest lesson of this school—the great weapon of their policy—the art to be initiated into with the first dawn of reason and pursued and perfected through life, being duplicity and dissimulation. This poor child at ten showed herself no mean proficient—she showed herself at least thoroughly alive to its importance, and jealous of her own credit in this particular. There is something at once pretty and melancholy in the following letter to her mother, written at ten years old, which is justly quoted as an evidence of her precocious talent, and with less reason, for the *promise* which these early years held out. Children dearly love a secret, it is quite congenial to their nature to have mysteries, and with requisite training they may become early adepts at concealment. It was Mary's misfortune, rather than her fault, that this natural propensity should have been cultivated and developed, and set off to her own mind with a great show of duty towards her mother:—

'1552.

'Madame,—I have received the letters which you have been pleased to write to me by Aztus Asquin, by which I have learnt the pleasure you have felt that I have kept secret the things which it pleased you to send me. I can assure you, Madame, that nothing that comes from you shall be known by me (*ne sera sceu par moy*). . . . I humbly beg you to believe that I shall not fail to obey you in everything in which you are pleased to command me, and to think that the chief wish I have in the world is to be obedient and agreeable to you, doing you every possible service as I am bound. I have seen, by your letters, that you beg me to approve the marriage-gift of the late M. Asquin to his son, who is here. I humbly

entreat you never to give me anything but your commands, as to your very humble and very obedient daughter and servant, for otherwise I shall not think I have the happiness of being in your good graces. As for my master, I will do as you have told me. I have shown the letters you have been pleased to write to me to my uncle, Monsieur de Guise, thinking that you would wish it, though, after the directions you have given me, I should not have shown them but that I was afraid I could not arrange things without his help. I write two other letters with my own hand; the one concerning Mde. de Paroys, and the other for my master, that you may be able to show that of my said master without this, so that they may not think that you have told me anything about it. . . . I should have written to you in cypher, but my secretary has told me that it was not necessary, and that he was writing to you in cypher. I write also to my natural brother (*frère bastard*), according to the advice of my uncle, M. de Guise. The said letters are open, in order that you may deliver them if you approve of them.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 6.

What a maze for a poor child's head of secrets and mysteries, and with what satisfaction our queen throws herself into these arcana. We have no doubt she could at this time quite command both speech and countenance, so that no one about her should guess she knew what she did not choose to be supposed acquainted with. This is all very ingenious and clever in a child, but we do think may fairly make us mistrust the intrinsic sincerity of the 'frank artless manner,' and the 'open and unsuspicious temper' her panegyrists so constantly extol in her, and by which they will always interpret the hard facts of the case which give so contrary an impression. But our readers may think us harsh in deducing such consequences from a little girl's dutiful letter to her mamma. It is solely to show her an apt pupil in a bad system. This same bad system must also share the greater part of the blame in a subsequent act of atrocious duplicity, in the well known matter of the secret bonds she was induced to put her hand to when she reached the age of fifteen. Previous to her marriage with the Dauphin, and before the arrival of the Scotch commissioners, who were to bring the articles of agreement from the Scotch parliament, Henry and her uncles, the Guises, got her to sign three secret bonds. The first of these acts (*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 46) was a full and free donation of Scotland to the Kings of France, in case of her dying without heirs, in consideration of the services which those monarchs had at all times rendered to Scotland by defending her from England, *her ancient and inveterate enemies*, and especially for the assistance which she had received from Henry II., who had maintained her independence at his own expense during her minority; the second act made over all the revenues of Scotland to France till a certain impossible sum, alleged to be due but not acknowledged by Scotland, should be paid; and the third confirmed these preceding documents, *whatever public articles of agreement she might be induced to sign*. After stating that for certain

reasons she has no means of opposing openly measures in Scotland which she disapproves, the protestation goes on:—

* For this reason she has protested, and protests, that whatever agreement or consent she has made, or may make, to the articles and instructions sent by the estate of her kingdom, in case she dies without heirs, she wishes and intends that the dispositions made by her in that case for and to the profit of the Kings of France, remain entire, and have their full and entire effect in spite of the agreements and consents that she makes, or will make, hereafter, if any she makes, on these articles and instructions, or otherwise, as things that will be made directly against her will, desire, and intention.' —*Labanoff*, vol. i. p. 55; *Tytler*, vol. vi. p. 70.

These three documents she signed voluntarily; and fifteen days after, with equal willingness, she signed publicly before the Scotch commissioners acts and agreements of a directly contrary import, securing the integrity of Scotland, its independence of France, and appointing an heir chosen by them in case of her dying without issue. The sin of this iniquitous transaction lies so heavily on the French court, that, by comparison, Mary, a child of fifteen, may be hardly said to bear the guilt of it; but it at least illustrates what her education had been, and what principles and practices she was already made familiar with.

It is quite in conformity with the tone of her education, that Mary should send a letter to her mother by these same commissioners, full of smooth, graceful satisfaction with everything and everybody, the king, the queen, her young husband, her relations and friends, and also with the favours that had been bestowed on these same duped commissioners, who 'had been so well received and gratified in every possible way;' (*de tout ce qu'il a esté possible.*)

Mary is justly termed unfortunate, though not, as we have said, from the circumstances which are understood to obtain for her this affecting epithet; her misfortune seems really to lie in the fitness and congeniality of the position in which she was now placed with the leading features of her character. There was in herself nothing counter to the training she received—no resolute independent sense of right and wrong to resist this false teaching. Things around her were all smooth, easy, and delightful, and she seems to have acquiesced without a doubt in the fact, that this was the way kings reigned, and nations were ruled. She at once acquired high ideas of the rights of sovereignty, especially of its superiority to, and independence of, every earthly tribunal; and low ones of the responsibilities of this exalted station, and of the duties which it imposes. Her sojourn in France deprived her of all feelings of nationality, so that she regarded her own country only as a dependency on

her adopted kingdom, important to her as the source of her own power and greatness, but mere banishment and expatriation as her home. It is hardly a censure to say that Mary wanted patriotism, so removed was she from everything to excite this virtue; but still, on this point we find a great contrast between her and her rival (to adopt the received phraseology) Elizabeth. We do not believe, that, had Elizabeth, even at the same early age, been exposed to the same temptation, she could have been induced by any power, or for the sake of any personal advantage, so to sign away her people and her country by a stroke of her pen. But the deep duplicity in which Mary was bred made nothing seem true or real. No promise was binding, nothing was what it seemed to be; and, consequently, the only objects worth striving for were pleasure and personal aggrandisement, and the only intellectual endowments to be cultivated were such as furthered these ends,—external graces and accomplishments, and a certain subtle penetration, as far removed from the qualities of a sound judgment, as cunning is from wisdom. What real good Henry and the Guises could have proposed to themselves by this sacrifice of the young queen's integrity, it is difficult to make out; any honest man would have seen it was a measure as impossible to carry out as it was unjust in conception, but it was only too much in conformity with the treacherous policy of those times. Beyond its moral influence on those concerned, and as illustrating the principles on which Mary's character was formed, it did, in fact, produce no fruit,—it came to nothing. The next step taken by her under their advice had more definite consequences, though in itself less reprehensible. It was the first of the many 'fatal' measures which mark her reign; fatal, as filling her own mind with pretensions she could never realize, and never abandon; and fatal, as bringing upon her the permanent jealousy and mistrust of that great queen, whose genius always ruled over Mary's. For if we will amuse ourselves with ideas of fatality, apart from the inevitable consequences of men's actions, to Mary might well have been addressed the soothsayer's warning words:—

'Thy dæmon, that's the spirit which keeps thee, is
Noble, courageous, high, unmatchable,
Where *hers* is not; but, near *her*, thy angel
Becomes a Fear, as being o'erpower'd; therefore
Make space enough between you.'

It was an evil hour for Mary, when, insulting Elizabeth's honour and daring her vengeance, she called herself Queen of England;—an empty claim, as we regard it now, for Elizabeth

knew so firmly how to keep her own, that we cannot understand what a strong grasp it needed; but no empty claim to either queen, never forgotten by her who was injured by it, nor in her inner intention once renounced by Mary. And it should be kept equally in mind by the student of those times, that, on Mary Tudor's death, Mary of Scotland did assert herself her heir to the English throne by virtue of the bull which declared Elizabeth illegitimate. For here we find a key to much of that 'malignity,' 'vindictiveness,' 'envy,' and 'jealousy,' which is ascribed to Elizabeth in all her dealings with Mary; sometimes most unjustly ascribed,—for often Elizabeth acted like the truest friend to her rival, and did what her best friends did, or ought to have done,—but on other occasions, with too much colour of truth. The jealousy that Elizabeth felt against Mary was not, we believe, that weak, personal sentiment, which it is assumed to be. It was not a vain woman's jealousy of another's superior attractions, but it was a queen's jealousy of a powerful rival, who had gifts and talents to assert her claims, and followers to maintain them. Elizabeth, great woman as she was, had yet too high an opinion of her own right to general admiration, and too many flatterers to feed these notions, to have much room for jealousy. All Mary's lovers had been rejected by herself; she was the object of universal homage and unbounded adulation; and, perhaps, none of all the judgments of posterity regarding herself would have surprised her more than its unanimous award of the palm of beauty and grace to her sister queen.

Our author, though full of prejudice against Elizabeth, is yet alive to her great qualities. It is thus that he introduces her to his readers. We omit a long and well-known extract, which occurs in the middle of the passage, from the account of her person and manner left by the Venetian ambassador:—

'What was the character of this princess, whose hostility the court of France did not fear to excite against Mary Stuart, who, from that moment, became her rival, both as a queen and a woman? High-spirited, imperious, extremely proud, with great energy, astuteness, and capacity, Elizabeth had long been compelled to dissimulate her feelings and her religious faith during the terrible reign of her sister, who would have proscribed her but for the support given her by Philip II. She had lived at a distance from the Court under strict surveillance, and had thus acquired those habits of deception which combined in her with the haughty and violent passions she inherited from her father. . . . To the most solid learning Elizabeth united the most agreeable accomplishments. She was an excellent musician, and danced to perfection. Certain gifts of person, great mental attractions, all the adornments of a brilliant education, much originality without sufficient grace, and the resources of a strong and lively imagination, rendered her remarkable as a woman; whilst her acute and

penetrating judgment, her unwearied application, her haughty and politic disposition, and her active ambition, destined her to be a great Queen.

'On the day of her accession she displayed those qualities which characterised all the rest of her life. She took possession of the throne as a matter of course, and passed from oppression to command without either surprise or uneasiness. Adopting the policy which was destined to constitute the glory of her reign, she pursued it assiduously, but without precipitancy. We cannot say she was a zealous Protestant, but she was averse to Catholicism, as the religion which had oppressed her youth, and still menaced her crown. She felt more disposed to detest than to contest it. She said that she had read neither Luther nor Calvin, but S. Jerome and S. Augustine, and she considered that the points of difference between the various Christian communities were of very little importance. She therefore restored Protestantism rather from policy than conviction, in order to give the direction of affairs, and the government of the state, to her own party, and withdraw it from her adversaries.

'She immediately surrounded herself with men of great ability or entire devotion to her service. Her two principal advisers were Lord Robert Dudley, one of the sons of the Duke of Northumberland, whom she appointed her Master of the Horse, and who remained her favourite as long as he lived; and William Cecil, whom she made Secretary of State, and who was her prime minister for forty years. Careful to retain those whom she had chosen, she was always well served. She never permitted her favourites to become for a single moment her masters, and her most experienced ministers were never more than her useful instruments. On all occasions, though she sought counsel, she acted upon her own decisions. Her will, guided solely by either calculation or interest, was sometimes slow, often audacious, always sovereign. In less than a month after she had succeeded Mary Tudor, the Spanish ambassador wrote to Philip II:—"She is held in incomparably greater dread than her sister. She orders and does whatever she pleases, just as absolutely as the king her father." Speaking of herself, with a full consciousness of what she was and what she could effect, Elizabeth said about this time, "that she would let the world know that there was in England a woman who acted like a man, and who was awed neither by a Constable of Montmorency like the King of France, nor by a Bishop of Arras like the King of Spain."—*Mignet*, vol. i. pp. 51—55.

Such was the woman whom Mary so rashly provoked. We do not esteem M. Mignet a judge of how far Elizabeth was influenced by religious feeling. He probably does not understand the position of the English Church, and its middle course between two extremes, which Elizabeth in her arbitrary way helped to establish. But there is truth, though unfriendly truth, in the rest. Elizabeth had duplicity. It was the art and study of the times, and she was an adept in it, as far as gaining her ends proves it.

But the practice of duplicity being universal, we must learn to discriminate between different kinds. That for which the Court of France of the period is so infamously distinguished was *aggressive* in its character, and so far unprovoked. It used it as a weapon of offence, as an assassin uses a dagger. Elizabeth's dissimulation was first assumed to protect her very life, which one rash word would have sacrificed; and in a general

review of her subsequent conduct we still see the same principle of self-defence—defence of herself and of her kingdom—in her practice of it. Mary began by claiming the throne of England, and though afterwards circumstances obliged her apparently to withdraw it, we see now, and doubtless Elizabeth knew then, that at any favourable moment the claim would be renewed. To guard against this favourable moment ever dawning, was henceforth one of the main objects of her policy, sometimes by very crooked means it must be granted, but it was adopted towards Mary to secure her own position rather than to encroach on that of others. If Mary had let her alone, and if her attitude from inevitable circumstances had been less threatening, Elizabeth, as much from inclination as good sense, would have maintained a sincere good understanding with her.

But between Mary and Elizabeth there was a still further difference in the character of the duplicity each practised; the one is politic, and bound up with politics and state craft, the other selfish and personal. Mary's crying sins of this nature were against the interests and feelings of her country, for private motives and the indulgence of personal ends; though she too, under French influence, could adopt their large aggressive plans of deception. Elizabeth's motives were national and patriotic. Perhaps circumstances may have aided this happy unison of interests, but as a fact, no private feeling ever led her to forget the welfare of her people; all her personal wishes for greatness and prosperity were bound up in theirs; in this sense she may be said to have had no private ends. When she sinned against honesty and truth, it was under a false notion that she was promoting her people's advantage as much as her own. Her private feelings and fancies were ever subservient to the public cause. She was often arbitrary and tyrannical, but she never forgot that the course she pursued required of her great personal sacrifices, and she knew she had no right to enact the absolute queen and the self-indulgent woman at the same time. Pleasure and the gratification of natural desires were always made to yield to greatness. She showed her people that if she ruled them with a strong hand she could control herself as sternly. Even her follies and vanities she contrived to make useful. 'The artificial politics of Elizabeth,' (says Hume,) 'never triumphed so much in any contrivances as in those which were conjoined with her coquetry;' and she was not ridiculous without rather helping on the cause in hand than obstructing it.

Mary, on the contrary,—and it is the secret of her influence,—was a woman in the full meaning of the word. First a woman, and then a queen. She could not give up her inclinations to her position. She could *act* the queen to perfection, but she

was unequal to the constant sacrifice, the long self-control needed by those who wield sovereign power. Like the Egyptian queen, whom she in some points resembles, she was

‘E’en a woman, and commanded
By such poor passions as the maid that milks,
And does the meanest charrs.’

And on this unqueenlike nature were engrafted perfect grace and beauty, constituting her queen of hearts, perhaps, but not queen of her people. At twenty-five Elizabeth felt herself the mother of her people; Mary through her whole life shows no touch of this maternal instinct. Her interests, her plots, her wishes, were all personal and private ones. Patriotism, such as it was, was to be found amongst her opponents—Murray and even Knox are examples of it; but Mary had apparently no conception of this sentiment. Her cause, and it was sometimes as much her misfortune as her fault, never at the best included more than a very small minority.

Both training and nature conspired to make these women opposites. Elizabeth's youth had been one of fear, and caution, and restraints, and her deportment always bore traces of this hard discipline in its stiffness and want of grace. Mary's had been tenderly fostered; she was admired, and even beloved, as far as the denizens of that court had hearts to love. Her ‘charming nature’ could expand in all the sunshine of general approval—there were no cold checks shutting her up within herself: her manner was therefore open, frank, engaging, and cordial—how should a prosperous joyous beauty's ever be otherwise? but it was only an accomplishment, formed not by the heart so much as by external circumstances. She had no need in her youth for habitual circumspection, and her general demeanour was the gainer by it. But her biographers claim much larger admissions, and expect us to believe in it against positive fact, as if amiable manners were incompatible with great crimes, and the deception which belongs to them; as if Elizabeth must be the dissembler, and Mary the generous victim of impulse, because the one betrays an awkward consciousness of a discreditable secret, the other shows an open smiling face through all, and can keep up two distinct currents of thought, the one represented by the unruffled *viso sciolto*, the other far down in the depths, away from sight and thought, and only stirred when the moment of action arrives. It only shows she was the more accomplished dissembler of the two, according to all the rules of art. All this was understood in their own day, and the general judgment of that time accords with our own. Elizabeth was beloved by her people because she loved them; because she acted for them, they revered and feared

her, but still more did they love her: they identified their safety with her own, and unfortunately the conscience of that period was not easily shocked by ordinary duplicity, where they themselves were the gainers. But Mary was neither feared nor loved nor respected by her people. The misfortune of religious differences might in part cause this; her path craved wary walking: but they never saw her acting for them as a whole; when she was most queenlike and most public spirited it was yet for herself. She could win over partisans, but she never gained her people to her side: when she plotted, it was against them, and not for them, and where treachery was an every day vice, she yet by one act succeeded in raising a storm of genuine sincere abhorrence, which amongst the *people* of her own land was never allayed.

Thus gifted, with such pretensions; ambitious, energetic, loving pleasure and excitement, and unscrupulous in the modes of obtaining them; with an ardent cultivated imagination and a cold heart; with impulses sometimes generous, but with a consistent indifference to truth; with a zeal for religion, but no submission to its precepts,—Mary, after her long minority and upon her early widowhood, eluding the English fleet which Elizabeth, in her indignation at the recent insult, had sent to impede her course, returned to her kingdom,—unwillingly returned: nor can we wonder, for never did a prince enter upon his reign under more difficult circumstances, never was country less fitted to obey and submit itself to female rule. She returned to Scotland, then a seething hot-bed of dissensions, where social misrule and centuries of civil war had undermined all ideas of law and justice, and disorganized the whole framework of society; where the nobility had neither loyalty, nor patriotism, nor honour towards one another, but all were for self, and personal or family aggrandisement; where the people were reduced to extremity and desperation by the alternate oppressions of contending factions: while, to add to these long-standing evils, this country seemed to be chosen for the arena in which the old and new principles of religious faith should fight out their differences with the least restraint from the hand of power,—or rather, with so equal a balance of physical strength to assist the intrinsic merits of the question, as made the conflict more a religious, as opposed to a political one, than in any country in Europe. While Hume tells us that the English were so passive with regard to religious changes that throughout the Tudor dynasty they altered their faith with each reign more willingly than the order of succession, the populace of Scotland were ardent theologians. Weary with oppressions, disgusted by the monstrous immoralities of the churchmen in power, and ripe for change, the principles of a

change in religion spread like wildfire or like light through the land, bringing (to their minds) not only hope of spiritual illumination, but anticipations of freedom, power, learning, cultivation, whatever is most enchanting to the hopes of an awakened people, in their train; and history seems to show that while the preachers of the Reformation brought zeal and sincerity,—tarnished, it is true, by a fierce intolerance,—to the conflict, their antagonists, too like that wicked steward taken at unawares, eating and drinking with the drunken, had little to oppose to the new truths brought to light, and the errors sometimes deduced from them, but an unreasoning bigotry and a vain endeavour to quench the whole movement by persecution.

It was a lasting misfortune to Scotland that there was then no one of power and genius and zeal to stand up for the old truths, which in the flood of new light were too likely to be forgotten, and thus that the mind of one man was left to organize the religion of his country. The hand which pulls down is not commonly fitted for reconstruction; and Knox, remorseless in his destruction of what he called idolatries, has left his religious edifice bare, not only of all graceful ornament, but of its most needful supports and defences.

Mary had conceived a great hatred of Knox, yet it seems clear that, trusting to her powers of fascination, she hoped much from her personal influence. He was too powerful to be put down by the strong arm, which would have been the natural and readiest method; but what effect might not her charms produce in softening the force of his fierce attacks upon her Church and its professors, or even winning him to her side! But Knox was the only man of her day whom Mary could not influence; who was blind to her fair face, deaf to her eloquent and pathetic words, callous even to her tears—never shed by Mary but as a last resource. Very early he seems to have settled Jezebel as her appropriate type, and Jezebel she always was to him so long as he lived to call her so. It would be more fair to charge Knox with brutality towards his queen, had his sombre prophecies and suspicions not been too fully verified by subsequent events. But it is impossible to read his interviews with her without being scandalized at the audacious freedom of his address, and without partaking too in Hume's cynical amusement at the scene they presented. 'This rustic apostle,' as he calls him, 'though he once condescended so far as to tell the queen 'that he would submit to her as Paul did to Nero, remained not 'long in this dutiful strain.' Poor Mary might well be bewildered at such a mode of address. The French court had furnished her with no parallel examples. But though she was at first dismayed at the wild rudeness of manners in her new

kingdom, it does not seem that she was permanently dispirited by the change from all the elegance she had been accustomed to. Youth, health, love of adventure, and greater freedom of action, seem soon to have reconciled her to a country which appeared simply barbarous to her at first; and though rude and uncouth, her people were not insensible to those charms which had left so deep an impression in the country she had quitted. On one of her first public appearances Tytler thus describes her court, and the impression she herself produced:—

‘The parliament which met was held with unusual pomp. Mary, surrounded by a brilliant cavalcade, rode in procession to the Tolbooth, where the Estates assembled: the hall was crowded, not only by the members, but glittered with the splendid dresses of the ladies of the court, who surrounded the throne and filled the galleries. The extreme beauty of the queen, and the grace with which she delivered the address in which she opened the proceedings, surprised and delighted her people. Many exclaimed, “May God save that sweet face! She speaks as properly as the best orator among them.”—*Tytler*, vol. vi. p. 280.

Nor did the austere morality of the Reforming party, and their hatred of every class of amusements, withhold her from indulgence in them to an extent dangerous at least to her character for prudence and royal dignity. So extreme was the popular animosity against the ceremonies and the professors of the old religion, and so ignorant of the principles of charity and toleration were their teachers, that even had Mary observed an austerity of manners equal to their own, so long as she had been zealous and devoted in the practice of her faith, it would have needed policy as well as prudence to maintain her position. She might even have been in the end a martyr to her fidelity. She *might* have been—but her panegyrists and Roman Catholic historians say that she *was*, and she herself died under the same persuasion—and it is this which we deny, and which the whole course of her life disproves. That cause must be ill off for bright examples—must be driven to strange shifts in its defence—that raises Mary, under the most favourable view that ingenious special pleading can take of her character, into a martyr for any good cause. The old faith of Scotland had no doubt its true martyrs, but they were not to be found amongst its leading supporters. Mary was one of the many on whom mistrust and suspicion produce recklessness rather than caution, and she was soon brought under the censures, not only of ‘sour fanatics,’ but of prudent men of the world, for the bold departures from dignity and queenly decorum to which her love of admiration and passion for every form of diversion led her. Angry and jealous eyes did watch her, to note down that she who maintained ‘the idolatry of the mass’ in her chapel, against all their remonstrances, and refused to profit by the godly exhortations of their ministers, was, as they esteemed it, consistent in her

derelictions, in bringing upon herself such indignities as led to the death of her mad lover, Chastelard. But though they might complain of her personal obstinacy in maintaining the faith in which she had been born and bred, in spite of their not very persuasive efforts for her conversion, the Reformers had really very little justice on their side so long as Murray was in power to act out Mary's professions of universal toleration—professions which she was always ready to make so long as there was nothing better to be done. Her government under his administration was really a wise and beneficent one, nor is there any stronger cause of quarrel with those times and their monstrous practices, their crying evils, and the equally desperate remedies which were then tolerated, than that they should bring so great a man as Murray under just suspicion of sometimes sharing, or at least conniving at them. A true patriot, where all besides were for themselves—just, where justice was almost forgotten, and wise in a large sense, where private ends and petty schemes had obscured the general judgment, we are sometimes at a loss to understand how a man of such undoubted qualities should ever be brought into the questionable positions in which we see him.

It was an evil day for Mary, when in opposition to his earnest remonstrances she chose Darnley for her husband, and thus turned her best adviser into something very like a rebel, in attitude at least, if not in intention. But in the first place, Mary liked the 'long boy,' as Elizabeth called him; next, it did seem as though, if she waited till all who had a right to a voice were of one mind, especially till Elizabeth (with whom Murray was commonly agreed) was satisfied with her choice of a husband, she should probably never be married at all; in the third place, Darnley, as being her cousin, and also connected through the mother's side with the house of Tudor, might help on her open claim to be acknowledged successor to Elizabeth, and the secret one, (which in her own mind always went along with it,) her present right to the English throne; lastly, he was a Roman Catholic, and Mary was urged by her foreign allies, and was also herself inclined, in spite of her professed policy of conciliation, to make a push for the restoration of the Roman Catholic religion by mere force. Nothing, we think, can better show that the defence of Mary involves a general depreciation and blackening of character towards all concerned with her, than the line Mr. Fraser Tytler takes on this point towards Murray. We will quote his words.

Murray gave, as the ground of his opposition to the marriage, that the Protestant religion was endangered by it; upon which Mr. Fraser Tytler says—

'Nothing upon the part of Murray could be more futile and unfounded than the pretence that the Protestant religion was in danger, or that the

queen at this moment had adopted any measures which threatened its security. It is happy for the truth, that on such a point we have the declaration of Murray and Lethington themselves. On the thirteenth of July, 1564, they stated to Cecil that the presence of Lenox in Scotland, even if he should be fortunate enough to ally himself with the most powerful person in the state, would be totally ineffectual to shake the national religion from that firm foundation on which it rested. These declarations were made, indeed, a year before this, but during the course of that year, not only had the Scottish queen introduced no one measure which could by any ingenuity be deemed an attack upon the national religion, but she had shown the most decided determination to support it as the religion of the state, and to enforce the cruel and unjust laws against those who adhered to the public exercise of a contrary faith. It is evident, therefore, that the Earl of Murray and the party of the nobles who opposed the marriage had raised the cry of "danger to the Church" merely to cover their own designs.—*Tytler*, vol. vi. p. 345.

Now a *year* at such a period may lead wise men to change their opinion. Murray spoke when he was in power, and could therefore answer for the conduct of matters according to his wishes; he raised his objection when his own influence was at an end, when Rizzio, acknowledged to be in the Pope's pay, whom his penetration would mistrust, though he might not then know all that we do of his secret workings for Rome, was rising in power. Nor would Mary's professed zeal to carry out the 'unjust laws' against her own religion be likely to deceive such a man into a belief of her sincerity; rather it might well produce a different effect. Though this was one of the very acts which afterwards succeeded under Charles IX. in lulling the suspicions of the Huguenots, the wiser Murray may have seen in these professions only an attempt to reconcile her Protestant subjects to the marriage she had at heart.

But what are the real facts of the case at this period, or at a time very little removed from it, when Mr. Tytler so boldly asserts that all fears were futile? It is true that in July 1565 she writes to a Scottish Laird in the Scotch of that period:—

'July 16, 1565.

'Trusty friend, we greet you well. The evil bruit and untrue report spread by seditious persons among our lieges has grieved us indeed, as that we should have intended to impede or molest any of our subjects in the use of their religion and conscience freely. A thing which never entered in our mind, although over many has credited the report; and to the effect that this vain bruit may vanish as a thing without ground or occasion, we have directed our letters to signify our sincere meaning to all our good subjects,' &c.—*Labanoff*, vol. i. p. 275.

But her earlier private letters to her uncle and the Pope are in a very different strain; not blamable in themselves, but showing another spirit altogether. The fact, however, which shows us Mary's real feeling, through all this profession of toleration, is, that the very first use she made of her power, within a very few months of the date of this letter, the first time that she felt

free to act, on subduing with so much spirit and success the rebellion that arose on her marriage with Darnley, was to sign the Band, as it is called, or League of Bayonne. It was under no sense of fear, but rather in the indulgence of revenge and in the triumph of success, when she for the first time felt emancipated from the restraints that had held her, that she signed what is thus described by Mr. Tytler himself. We give Mary the benefit of his opening apologies for her:—

‘Had Mary been left to herself, there is little doubt that the rebels would have been pardoned. Her natural generosity, and the intercession of some powerful friends, strongly impelled her to the side of mercy, and she had already consented to delay the parliament and to entertain proposals for the restoration of the banished lords, when an unforeseen circumstance occurred which led to unfortunate results. This was the arrival of two gentlemen, De Rambouillet and Clernau, on a mission from the French Court. Their message was outwardly one of mere ceremony, to invest the young king with the order of S. Michael; but, amid the festivities attendant on the installation, a more important and secret communication took place. Clernau, the special envoy of the Cardinal Lorraine, and Thornton, a messenger from Beaton, the Scottish ambassador in France, who had come to Court about the same time, informed Mary of the coalition which had been concluded between France, Spain, and the Emperor, for the destruction of the Protestant cause in Europe. It was a design worthy of the dark and unscrupulous politicians by whom it had been planned, Catherine of Medicis and the Duke of Alva. In the summer of the preceding year, the Queen Dowager of France and Alva had met at Bayonne during a progress in which she conducted her youthful son and sovereign Charles IX. through the southern provinces of his kingdom; and there, whilst the Court was dissolved in pleasure, those secret conferences were held which issued in the resolution that toleration must be at an end, and that the only safety for the Roman Catholic faith was the extermination of its enemies.’—*Tytler*, vol. vii. p. 15.

Rizzio, the paid emissary of Rome, now all-powerful in Mary’s counsels, urged her assent, and in spite of the dissuasions of some, she signed the League, and at the same time determined to carry matters to extremities against her rebel subjects: and here Tytler and Mignet, both favourers of Mary, take different lines; for while the first says, ‘Her *intention* of pardoning Murray and her other rebels was opposed by these foreign envoys;’ and again, ‘Mary was not naturally inclined to harsh and cruel measures, and for some time she vacillated;’ Mignet says, ‘But Mary was too passionate to be politic; she preferred to pursue her schemes of vengeance, and far from listening to Melvil’s representations that persons should not be urged to extremity lest they became dangerous; she angrily told him “I do not fear them. What would they dare, or what could they undertake?”’ (Vol. i. p. 200.)

‘She imagined herself,’ [says Mr. Tytler,] ‘a supporter of the Catholic Church, when she was giving her sanction to one of the worst corruptions of Romanism.’

an apology which may be made with equal justice for all the actors in this affair. Mary had private revenge to gratify, and was actuated by this motive to precisely the same degree as the rest were. Previous to this event Mary had addressed an autograph letter to Philip of Spain, asking his assistance, beginning:—

‘Sept. 10, 1565.

‘Monsieur, my good Brother,—The affection with which you have always employed yourself for the maintenance and support of our Catholic religion has made me before seek your favour and aid, foreseeing what now has happened in this kingdom, which tends to the entire ruin of the Catholics, and to the establishment of those unhappy errors, the which wishing to resist, the King my husband and myself will be in danger of losing our crown, and by the same means the *right which we claim elsewhere, (le droit que pretendons ayllieurs,)* if we have not the aid of one of the great princes of Christendom.’—*Labanoff*, vol. i. p. 281.

The King of Spain sent twenty thousand crowns in answer to this appeal, and wrote for her to the Pope, who sent her eight thousand. Any other succour it was not convenient for him to give, though he adds that they must not renounce the idea of asserting by armed force the Queen of Scotland’s right to the succession of England. ‘This project,’ he said, ‘concerns the cause of God which is mentioned by the Queen of Scotland, since it is evidently the only door by which religion can enter into the kingdom of England, for all others are now shut.’ (*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 192.)

Subsequent to her signing of the League she summoned a parliament for the condemnation of Murray and others; on which M. Mignet says:—

‘A short time before the meeting of this assembly, which she destined to further her revenge, and was desirous to associate in her plans in favour of the ancient Church, she sent the Bishop of Dumblane to assure the new Pope, Pius V., of her devoted obedience. She besought him to grant her both temporal and spiritual assistance, “in order to change,” she wrote, “the deplorable and unfortunate state of our kingdom. The moment is propitious, because our enemies are partly banished, and partly placed within our hands . . . If God and your Holiness, whose cause we maintain, come to our aid, with such assistance we shall overcome all obstacles.”’—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 200.

After this we leave it to our readers to decide whether the alleged reasons for Murray’s alarm and opposition to her marriage and its consequent change of counsels were so ‘futile’ and groundless. In the meanwhile, Mary enjoyed the life which these disturbances brought her into. At the beginning of the campaign,—on horseback, with pistols at her saddle-bow,—she put herself at the head of her army, and carried all before her, declaring she would rather peril her crown than lose her revenge; she wished to be a man, that she might know what it was to lie

out on the field all night and to walk the rounds; and on one occasion some noblemen of her retinue having represented to her that she would fatigue herself by so much riding, and by following the army in inclement weather, she replied, on the report of Paul de Foix, the French ambassador, 'that she would never cease to continue such fatigues until she had led them to London;' a threat probably not heard by Randolph, the English envoy, who accompanied her in the expedition, and, quite inspired by this restoration of the days of chivalry, thus wrote to Cecil: 'What desperate blows would that day have been given, when every man should have fought in sight of so noble a queen and so many fine ladies,—our enemies, to have taken them (our honours) from us, and we, to save our honours, and not to be bereft of them,—your honour may easily imagine.'

But the scene soon changed from this triumphant success. Events succeed one another rapidly in this part of Mary's history, and every turn of the page brings us upon something new and strange. Shakspeare might well talk of the whirligig of time in his day, for nowhere in man's history do we find such instances of its revenges; nowhere do the actors in the busy scene so rapidly change and reverse their positions towards one another. Faithful subjects become traitors, and are back again to their allegiance, and in favour, before we know how it can have been effected. We cannot tell who are plotters and who are confidential friends; who are faithful, who designing; for all are each by turn. Elizabeth's lovers make no scruple of planning her death; she in her turn is now an ally, now an enemy; no one knows where to have her. Mary is now pursuing her rebel brother to the death, then weeping tears of reconciliation in his arms; at one moment she is on the pinnacle of power, with all her enemies banished, or at her feet; and then, by some sudden turn, for which it is hard to find an adequate cause,—by the death of one man, and he an insignificant adventurer,—the tables are turned; she is the prisoner, and her enemies coolly concert what is to be done with her.

We need not go into the familiar details of her change of feeling towards her young husband; the wild excitement and freedom from restraint which would follow upon a warlike campaign, and the greater liberty of action which her success would prompt her to, might make the ordinary routine of decorous female life insupportable to Mary, and Darnley had nothing in him to counteract these ill influences. Blinded by a weak and childish pride, the consequence of Mary's unwise favours, he took no pains, after his marriage, to confirm his hold on her affections. She grew disgusted with and weary of him, and soon gave him cause for disgust in his turn, by the wilful intimacy

she indulged in with her low-born secretary, Rizzio. She was entirely guided by his counsels, which were well known to be all on the side of severity to the proscribed noblemen, and of active measures for the restoration of the old religion and the suppression of the new. As if all these causes did not sufficiently excite popular feeling against him, he assumed a great state and retinue, and was proud and intolerable in his deportment. Darnley, with good grounds, was jealous. The nobles were indignant at his political power. The people hated him for being a foreigner and a papist. Knox and his coadjutors regarded him as the representative of all the enemies of 'God's people,' (as they exclusively designated their followers and themselves,) from Oreb and Zeeb to Haman, and thought themselves divinely commissioned to sanction his destruction.

Rizzio's murder, with all its savage details, strangely illustrates the times. The public motives for which it was undertaken, and the sort of judicial character assumed by the murderers, seem to resolve it into an exercise of Lynch law, while the circumstances of brutal atrocity towards the queen rank it amongst the most savage deeds of blood of any age. Nor is Mary's courage and self-command amongst the least remarkable features in the affair. She never lost her powers of thought and action, nor was she as overwhelmed by it as the most courageous woman would now be. It was something more within possibility, more conceivable, more a part of the general experience of the age. All persons were inured to the thought of blood; and here, if anywhere, here only lies the excuse for that great deed of blood in which Mary herself so soon after engaged,—that the practices of murder and assassination were too common in Scotland for them to be held in quite the same awe and horror, or so utterly abhorrent to our nature as the law of our being holds them to be in peaceable times. We do not say it *is* an excuse; but with the weight of evidence we have, it would be more reasonable for Mary's apologists to make it one, than to attempt to clear her from the guilt altogether, as some have attempted to do.

And here we may see how Mary was prepared for the part she so soon acted. First, in the deep hatred with which Darnley's share in the murder inspired her towards him, expressed in the natural threat of the moment, 'Well, it shall be dear blood to some of you;' and chiefly in her power over herself at the same time to conceal this hatred, and actually, while her heart was yet sore with the death of her favourite, the scene of passionate recrimination with her husband, and the humiliating insults to herself, to dissimulate with him, to get up a reconciliation, to separate him from the conspirators, making him as contemptible to them as to herself by a public denial of his share

in the plot, and to make him assist her in her escape from the power of the conspirators. With extraordinary spirit and energy Mary escaped from their hands, and in a very short time was again in power, ruling paramount in Edinburgh, where she had so lately been a prisoner, avenging the death of Rizzio; and, to show her adherence to the course she had taken, appointing his brother secretary in his place. But all men saw that in her heart she hated Darnley, nor could she be persuaded, after the purpose of their apparent reconciliation was effected, to conceal her aversion. His life was miserable. She withdrew him from all share of public business, and forbade those about her to hold converse with him. 'He went up and down,' says Melvil, 'all alone, seeing few durst bear him company.' Her confidence was given to the Earls of Bothwell (who now first appears prominent in her history), Huntley, whose sister he had married, and the Catholic Bishop of Ross, who was so long her faithful adherent; but, says Mignet, 'Mary did not proceed to further extremes against Darnley, until her passion for another was added to her increased repugnance to himself.'

On the 19th of June, 1566, she gave birth to a son, which event was immediately communicated to Elizabeth, who on the moment of receiving the news, by a sudden pang of grief and envy, showed how much the course she had so firmly chosen for herself really cost her. She was giving a court ball; while she was dancing, Cecil went up to her, and whispered in her ear. Interrupting the dance, she sunk dejectedly into an arm-chair, and said to the ladies who surrounded her, 'that the Queen of Scots was mother of a fair son, while she was but a barren stock.'

The birth of this son revived the question of the succession, always so distasteful to Elizabeth. The English parliament thought it an occasion for expressing their anxious wish to have the question settled, though they were presently silenced by their queen, and Mary was not less eager on her side. But here, on entering upon the darkest page of Mary's history, we will quote from M. Mignet's straightforward narrative:—

'Notwithstanding Mary Stuart's ardent desire, the English succession remained in the same state as before. She still retained her claims, but had not succeeded in obtaining their recognition. She soon, however, compromised them, and, moreover, exposed herself to the loss of the crown of Scotland. After the birth of the prince royal, the misunderstanding increased between her husband and herself—a fatal passion at this time took possession of her heart. The object of this passion was the Earl of Bothwell, the most enterprising and dangerous man in Scotland. James Hepburn, fourth Earl of Bothwell, was then thirty years of age. He had succeeded his father in 1556, was possessed of large property, and held important offices in the kingdom. By his marriage with Lady Jane Gordon, he had become the brother-in-law of the Earl of Huntley, and had united one of the most

powerful families of the South with the most powerful family of the North. He was distinguished for great bravery, consummate audacity, boundless and unscrupulous ambition. Equally undisguised in his plans as in his vices, he aspired first to gain the affections of the Queen, and then to marry her. Although he was far from handsome, his martial bearing, his taste for pleasure, the undaunted resolution of his character, his air of chivalrous devotion, and the easy and elegant continental manners beneath which he concealed the wild and extravagant passions of his country, charmed the imagination of the Queen, and gave Bothwell great influence over her. Mary Stuart sought to render Bothwell a faithful and useful servant, but she speedily found in him a lover and a master.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 235.

Side by side with this description we will give his character by Mr. Fraser Tytler, remarkable for the ingenuity with which he turns Mary's toleration, not to say absolute indifference to his infamous morals, into a sort of merit, which is reflected, in some degree, back upon the man himself:—

'His ambition and audacity were unbounded. He was a man of notorious gallantry, and had spent a loose life on the Continent, from which, it was said, he had imported some of its worst vices. In attaining the objects of his ambition he was perfectly unscrupulous as to the means he employed, and he had generally about him a band of broken and desperate men, with whom his office of Border Warden made him familiar; hardened and murderous villains, who were ready on the moment to obey every command of their master. In one respect Bothwell was certainly better than many of his brother nobles. There seems to have been little craft or hypocrisy about him, and he made no attempt to conceal his infirmities or vices under the cloak of religion. It is not unlikely that, for this reason, Mary, who had experienced his fidelity to the crown, was more disposed to trust him in any difficulty than those stern and fanatical leaders who, with religion on their lips, were often equally indifferent as to the means they employed. It is certain that from this time she began to treat him with great favour, and to be guided by a preference so predominant that it was not unlikely to be mistaken for a more tender feeling.'—*Tytler*, vol. vii. p. 46.

Mr. Tytler never absolutely denies the reality of Mary's affection for Bothwell; he only tenderly delays the admission of it, his honesty as an historian compelling him to a detail of facts which can allow of no other construction. We have, throughout his story, little apologetic hints, preparatory to this disgraceful feature of Mary's character; such as—'It was Mary's weakness 'to be hurried away by the predominating influence of some one 'feeling and object.' 'It was the misfortune of her ardent disposition that she was always under the domination of some strong 'and engrossing feeling, which sometimes led her to disregard 'appearances, and to believe she could never sacrifice enough to 'the object of her approval.' Only Miss Strickland ventures on the bold line of *entirely denying* that Mary ever cared for Bothwell at all—decidedly the best line, we should say, for a lady to take, who advocates the cause of this unfortunate queen—but a line so glaringly opposed to the facts of the case, to the universal consent of all that deserves to be called history, to every docu-

ment worthy of respect, and to the whole course of Mary's public and private conduct, as proves that feminine zeal for the honour of her sex has unfitted her, on this occasion at least, for the rigid and severer duties of the historian :—

'It is impossible' [she says] 'for any one who reads those details,' [Du Croc, the French ambassador, had described a quarrel between Mary and Bothwell after their marriage,] 'and remembers that they were written by a person who was behind the scenes, and related that which he had heard and seen, to believe for one moment that Bothwell was ever the object of Mary's love, or that her marriage with him originated from any other cause than dire necessity.'—*Miss Strickland's Letters of Queen of Scots*, vol. i. p. xxvii.

Du Croc's letter proves nothing of the kind, nor did he think anything of the kind, nor desire to convey this impression when he wrote it; on the contrary, he says, just after the said quarrel had happened, that the marriage is *already* repented of by Mary, which implies a *change* of feeling, and not that she had always been averse to it. This has been a digression, but it is amusing to see upon how slight a foundation a theory can be formed, against overwhelming opposing evidence, and also to what slender straws Mary's advocates have to trust in their defence.

Her contemporaries, at least, were not of this mind; all parties joined in observing this growing preference. Politicians wrote to one another, commenting on the increasing favour of the new favourite, which 'miscontenteth many;'—a circumstance which seems always to have acted as a sort of spur to Mary, who was stimulated by opposition;—and poor Darnley augured all sorts of evils from it to himself. He wrote secretly to the Pope, accusing the Queen of lukewarmness in religion (Bothwell being a Protestant), and feared for his life, which, with his ill conscience, and in the present aspect of affairs, was not unreasonable. He even meditated retiring to the Continent, but wanted resolution; indeed, he had always an affection for Mary, which the slightest kindness on her part could revive. But the time was not come for such experiments with his feelings. She preferred exposing his weakness, and bringing him into general contempt, and making all the world party to her private sentiments towards him. She did not care who should see the 'great grudges she entertained in her heart against him,' and always had entertained since Rizzio's murder. This event, which had so naturally disgusted her with her husband, had also been the means of bringing Bothwell forward, as his services had materially strengthened her position, and from that time he obtained unbounded influence over her. She heaped favours and offices upon him;¹ and upon occasion of his being wounded in some

¹ See Laing, vol. i. p. 13.

Border quarrels, betrayed such an amount of anxious alarm as seems to have raised general suspicion. Her visit to him on this occasion has been disputed, in every stage; its purposes, dates, results, are all canvassed and concluded upon, according to the view of the writer. It is the first great skirmish before the regular battle. M. Mignet has thus concluded upon it:—

‘On the 6th of October, (1566,) the Queen sent hither the Earl of Bothwell with the title of Lord Lieutenant, to repress these disorders, and restore tranquillity. On the 8th she repaired in person to Jedburgh to hold her assizes, and to add the sanction of justice and armed force. On that same day Bothwell had with great bravery engaged in personal conflict with John Elliot, of Park, a notorious freebooter. In the scuffle Bothwell was severely wounded, and it was found necessary to convey him without loss of time to the neighbouring castle of Armitage. His illness furnished most conclusive proofs of Mary’s attachment to him. “Understanding,” says Crawford, “the certain report of this accident, the Queen was so highly grieved in heart that she took no repose of body till she saw him. The discharge of her judicial functions detained her at Jedburgh until the 15th of October, but no sooner was she at liberty, than she took horse and hastened to the castle where her favourite lieutenant was lying wounded. She was accompanied on her journey by Murray and some other nobles. Although Hermitage was eighteen miles distant from Jedburgh, she went and returned the same day.¹ She spent an hour with Bothwell, and notwithstanding the fatigues of the day, she sat up until late at night writing to him whom she had just left. The prostration of strength which ensued, and,” adds Crawford, “the great distress of mind for the Earl of Bothwell, threw her the next day into a most dangerous illness. She fell into a swoon, and remained for some hours at the point of death. She was then seized with a violent fever, and continued insensible for several days. When she had somewhat recovered from this apparently desperate state, she thought her end was approaching, requested the nobles who were present to pray for her, confided her son to the guardianship of the Queen of England, and sent to inform her husband of her precarious condition. Bothwell, now convalescent, had hastened to her with other members of the privy council, and many of the most important nobles of the kingdom. Darnley did not arrive at Jedburgh until the 28th of October, two days after a favourable crisis had placed the Queen’s life out of danger. Finding her so much recovered, he remained at Jedburgh only one night, and returned immediately to Glasgow.’—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 240.

From this time dates the history of the Darnley murder. Mary recovered slowly, and was overwhelmed with melancholy. On the 20th of November she arrived at Craigmillar, a castle about a league from Edinburgh, careworn and ready to sink under the contradictory feelings which agitated her. ‘The Queen is not at all well,’ writes the ambassador Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow. ‘I believe the principal part of her disease to consist of a deep grief and sorrow; nor does it seem possible to make her

¹ Laing says, ‘The difficulties and haste of the journey are still preserved in the tradition of the country; that her white palfrey sank in a morass which retains the name of the Queen’s Moss, and that she was accompanied only by ten attendants, who extricated her.’—Vol. i. p. 17.

'forget the same; still she repeats these words,—“I could wish ‘to be dead.’” And Lethington, who so soon devised a mode for releasing her from her troubles, says in a letter to the same person, ‘It is a heart-break for her to think that he should be ‘her husband; and how to be free of him she sees no outlet.’ ‘This knowledge of Mary Stuart’s private feelings,’ says Mignet, ‘originated a number of fatal ideas in the minds of those that ‘surrounded her;’ and of the introduction of these fatal ideas, Mary herself has given an account in the Protestation she wrote and sent to the Earls of Huntley and Argyle, to sign at the Westminster Conference. Of course it was written to defend herself from guilt, but how far it exonerates her is another matter. The murderers of Rizzio—Morton, Ruthven, and Lindsey—were connected by ties of friendship and kindred with many members of the Privy Council. It occurred to these that there was one acceptable service by which they might procure for them the Queen’s pardon. If they had been banished for one murder, they might be recalled to another. Lethington, clever and absolutely unscrupulous, first introduced the idea to her mind. This extraordinary conference is thus described by Mignet. Our readers must remember that the facts are taken from Mary’s own admission; and it should be noted at the same time that Murray always denied the part attributed to him:—

‘He communicated his plan to Bothwell, who joined in it with all the ardour of his headstrong ambition, and made it known to Argyle and Huntley. According to the statement of the Queen’s friends he mentioned it also to Murray, who offered no objection to the scheme. After having concerted the matter among themselves, the new confederates repaired to Mary Stuart. Lethington addressed her in their name. He reminded the Queen of the great and intolerable injuries that she had received from her husband, laying much stress upon the ingratitude which he had displayed towards her, and upon the offences of which he was daily guilty. He then added, that if Her Majesty would be pleased to pardon the Earl of Morton, and the Lords Ruthven and Lindsey, they, in concert with the rest of the nobility, would find means to separate her from her husband by a divorce, so that she would no longer be involved in disagreement with him. This proposition caused her no surprise. She at first gave her consent, upon condition that the divorce should be legal, and should be no prejudice to the rights of her son. But a divorce was not so easily obtained, since it would be necessary to allege as the reason for it their near relationship, in reference to which the Pope had granted them a dispensation, or to bring Darnley to trial for adultery, or else to prosecute him on the charge of treason.

‘These difficulties could not escape Mary’s notice, and she knew that she would be exposed either to the delays of an uncertain negotiation, or to the scandal of a disgraceful trial. She accordingly affected scruples, and said that she would willingly retire into France, and leave Darnley in Scotland until he acknowledged his faults. But Lethington replied to her, that the nobles of her kingdom would not allow her to do so; and he even ventured,

in mysterious terms, to inform her of their dark designs. "Madam," he said, "souce ye not, we are here of the principal of your Grace's nobility and counsel, that shall find the means well to make your Majesty quit of him without prejudice of your son; and albeit that my Lord of Murray here present be little less scrupulous for a Protestant than your Grace is for a Papist, I am assured he will look through his fingers thereto, and will behold our doings and say nothing of the same." The Queen understood the full meaning of this insinuation, and replied that it was her pleasure nothing should be done by which any spot might be laid upon her honour, but she displayed no great indignation at the idea, and contented herself with saying, "Better permit the matter to remain in the state it is, abiding till God in his goodness put remedy thereto." Lethington took no heed of this slight opposition, and answered, "Madam, let us guide the business among us, and your Grace shall see nothing but good, and approved by Parliament."—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 245.

The conversation from this extract is Mary's *own* recording, and *very shortly after it took place, the banished lords were recalled*; men whom she knew to be capable of any violence, and naturally anxious by any service to restore themselves to her favour. A month after this meeting, the baptism of the young prince took place with great pomp, on the 17th of December, at Stirling Castle. Elizabeth was godmother, (or gossip, as she calls it,) and presented a golden font for the occasion, the fate of which was to be presently after melted down to furnish money for carrying on the war. Mary conducted herself towards the assembled guests with infinite grace and amiability. Bothwell, though a Protestant, had the ordering of the Catholic service, and Darnley, solitary and sullen, remained under the same roof, but did not show himself nor take any part. The King was contemned in his own court; the father had no place at the baptism of his son. After the excitement which any occasion called out, Mary again sunk into despondency, and Du Croc writes, 'I can't pretend to foretel 'how all may turn, but I will say that matters cannot subsist 'long as they are, without being accompanied with sundry bad 'consequences.' How can we doubt, that at this period she was making up her mind to her share in the tragedy that so soon followed. Morton, Ruthven, and Lindsey, by what Mr. F. Tytler calls 'a judicious extension of mercy,' were pardoned, and returned, and, about the same time, (Dec. 23,) she restored the Archbishop of St. Andrew's consistorial jurisdiction, which had been suppressed since the Reformation, a measure to which subsequent events give a dark significancy.¹ Their pardon was declared early in January, an event which naturally filled Darnley with alarm. They were the men who had been once his accomplices, and he had denounced and deserted them. He at once left the Court, and went to his father, the Earl of Lennox, at Glasgow, where he fell ill. It at first looked like the effects of poison, but

¹ Laing, vol. i. p. 23.

presently proved to be small-pox. While he lay helpless, the plot against his life went on, Bothwell being the principal actor in it. He sought an interview with Morton immediately on his return, and pressed him to join the plot, assuring him that the Queen had given her consent. But Morton, grown wary by experience, refused without her hand writ for a warrant. On this, Bothwell returned to the Queen in the hope of persuading her to write what was required, but he failed; upon which Lethington sent a messenger with directions "to show to the Earl of Morton that the Queen" 'will hear no speech of that matter appointed to him:' an oracular sentence, which is accepted by some as her indignant condemnation of the plot, with how much justice, connected with subsequent events, our readers can judge. But she would certainly, in any case, know better than to commit herself in so needlessly formal a manner. On the 20th of January, Mary writes to the Archbishop of Glasgow at Paris, detailing a conspiracy which she affects to have discovered of Darnley's attempt to gain the person of the young prince his son, and goes on as follows:—

'His behaviour and thankfulness to us is equally well known to God and the world, especially our own indifferent subjects see it, and in their hearts, we doubt not, condemn the same. Always we perceive him occupied and busy enough to have inquisition of our doings; which, God willing, shall always be such as none shall have occasion to be offended with them, or to report of us in any ways but honourably, however he, his father, and their fautors speak, which we know want no good will to make us have ado, if their power were equivalent to their minds. But God moderates their forces well enough, and takes the means of the execution of their pretences from them.—*Ibid.* p. 251.

This letter is written on the 20th of January. Next day she departed for Glasgow, accompanied as far as Callender by Bothwell and his brother-in-law, Huntley having engaged Bothwell's confidential servant, who goes by the name of French Paris, and whose subsequent confession is so remarkable, as her chamberlain. On Thursday, the 23d, she arrived at Glasgow. Darnley, having heard of her approach, was seized with an undefinable fear, and sent a gentleman to meet her,—'he was still infirm,' he said, 'and did not presume to come to her until he knew her wishes, and was assured of the removal of her displeasure.' To this Mary briefly replied, 'that there is no medicine against fear,' and, passing on towards Glasgow, came into Darnley's bed-chamber. Here, though nothing had transpired to change her opinion since the previous Monday, she employed all her art to bring about a reconciliation, to reassure his mind, to remove his suspicions, and gain his confidence. 'At heart,' says Mignet, 'Darnley had always been strongly attached to her, and his un-

¹ Morton's Confession, Laing, vol. ii. p. 28.

'requited affection and wounded pride had been the causes of 'his withdrawal from Court.' He was ready now to confess his errors, and to promise everything that she required. He entreated her not to leave him again, and when she asked him to accompany her in a litter to Craigmillar, he gladly consented, on condition that the harmony of former times might be restored. We have a very full and minute account of this interview; strangely circumstantial, indeed; and from whose hand? From Mary's own, in a letter to Bothwell full of most graphic detail, most vividly given. Our readers all know the 'Silver Casket' and its contents. Yet we must pause in our narrative upon this first mention of it. How little did she think when, too excited by guilty love, guilty consciousness, and the weight of a wicked deed in the very act of its performance, to sleep, she traced those passionate, impure, most treacherous lines, that what was then done in secret, at dead of night, with injunctions for immediate destruction, should remain to bring damning evidence against her, to be treated of in Parliaments and read in Councils, to be translated, canvassed, word by word critically analysed, to stand for ever a witness against her which could not then, and cannot now be escaped from or evaded!—feebly denied, indeed, in her own day, and more confidently, as distance and time drew their veil over this perplexed and stormy period; but, as the science of historic investigation advances, only the more firmly established by every attempt to disprove their genuineness: till the only resource of those who *will* not believe that these letters were from Mary's hand, is indiscriminate, unsupported denial and assertion, which might as justly be applied, and would be as conclusive, against the most universally received fact in history. Our limits will not allow us to do more than assert our full conviction of their genuineness, as literal translations, that is, in English and Scotch, of Mary's original French, of which, perhaps, we should explain, nothing remains but the opening sentence which heads each letter. But for any who wish to pursue the question and judge for themselves, we would recommend the perusal of Laing's 'Dissertation on the Darnley Murder,' where all these letters and papers may be found, together with the confessions of the principal actors in the murder, and very clear, masterly conclusions upon them. One point of evidence, however, he does not dwell upon, being, we think, insensible to the literary merits, (they possess no other,) of these papers. They are full of nature and feeling, such as it is. We might almost say it is impossible that they should be forgeries, though people have not scrupled to attribute them to one plotter after another, as if any man of business in that period of epistolary stiffness and form-

ality, could assume at the moment a clever, excited, passionate woman's style; and was equal to the task of expressing the conflicting emotions of a mind in a course of sin, and on the verge of committing a great crime.

These papers consist first of eight letters to Bothwell, four of which were written previous to the murder,—two from Glasgow and two from Kirkfield,—and three from Stirling after the murder, which relate to the concerted scheme for her abduction by him previous to their marriage; and an eighth letter from Linlithgow immediately preceding that event; of two contracts of marriage between them—one supposed to be written before her husband's death, the other signed by her and Bothwell, but written by Huntley previous to Bothwell's divorce from his present wife; and a series of twelve sonnets addressed by Mary to Bothwell. Of these remarkable documents Laing observes:—

'The very disappearance of the originals demonstrates that they were genuine. During the administration of the four regents they were carefully preserved. From Murray they passed successively to Lennox and Morton, on whose execution they were conveyed secretly to Ruthven, created Earl of Gowrie, one of the confederates, from whom Elizabeth's solicitude to obtain the custody of the casket attests her conviction that the letters were authentic. It appears, however, that they were retained by Gowrie for the vindication of the confederates. As the young king was informed that they were then (1582) in his hands, as Mary was solicitous to get them delivered up or destroyed, and as the Duke of Lennox, his favourite, who was entirely in her interest, had applied to detain them, their disappearance on the attainder and execution of Gowrie (1584) must be ascribed to the desire of her son to suppress those documents of his mother's guilt, which, if spurious, would neither have been preserved by the four regents nor destroyed by James.'—*Laing*, vol. i. p. 332.

M. Mignet has no doubt whatever of the authenticity of the letters, and quotes largely from them. Some extracts from the 'Long letter' must be given in continuation of our narrative. It must have filled several sheets, taking up nine octavo pages of print. We must give the French opening by which it is known and the words of which must be so familiar to all controversialists on the subject.

'Estant party du lieu ou j'avois laissé mon cœur, il se peult aysement juger quelle estoit ma contenance, veu ce qui peult un corps sans cœur, qui a esté cause que jusque à la disnée je n'ay pas tenu grand propos, aussi personne ne s'est voulu avancer jugeant bien qu'il n'y faisait bon.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 146.

After describing her journey, and the messenger sent her from Darnley, she says—(we quote indiscriminately from the Scotch or English translation, as the sense seems to be best rendered):—

'He said he was so glad to see me that he welcomed to die for gladness. He found great fault that I was pensive. I departed to supper. This

bearer will tell you of my arriving; he prayed me to return, the which I did. He declared to me his sickness, [grief,] and that he would make no testament, but only leave all things to me, and that I was the cause of his malady because of the regret he had that I was so strange to him. And thus, he said, "You ask me what I mean by the cruelty contained in my letter, it is of you alone that will not accept my offers of repentance. I confess that I have failed, but not into that which I ever denied, and so have many other of your subjects, and you have well pardoned them: . . . I am young . . . May not a man of my age, for lack of counsel, fall twice or thrice, or in lack of his promise, and at last repent himself and be chastised by experience? If I may obtain pardon, I protest I shall never make fault again; and I crave no other thing but that we may be at bed and board together as man and wife, and if you will not consent hereunto I will never rise from this sick-bed. I pray you tell me your resolution. God knows how I am punished for making my god of you, and for having no other thought but on you." . . . I did still answer him, but that would be too long to write at length. . . . In the end he desired much that I should lodge in his lodging. I have refused. . . . He said to me, "I have heard say you have brought a litter with you, but I would rather have gone with yourself." I told him that so I would myself bring him to Craigmillar, that his physicians and I also might serve him without being far from my son. He said he was ready when I would . . . as for myself he would rather lose his life than do me the least displeasure, and used so many kind flatteries, so coldly, and so wisely, as you would marvel at. . . . He would not let me go, but would have me to watch with him. I made as though I thought all to be true, and would think upon it. I have excused myself from sitting up with him this night, for he says that he sleeps not well; you never heard him speak better nor more humbly. And if I had not proof of his heart to be as wax, and that mine were not as a diamond whereunto no shot can make breach but that which comes forth of your hand, I would have almost had pity on him. But fear not, the place shall hold unto the death. Remember, in recompense thereof, that you suffer not yours to be won by that false race that would do no less to yourself. I believe they have been at school together; he has ever the tear in his eye: he salutes every body, yea, unto the least, and makes piteous caressing unto them, to make them have pity upon him . . . This is my first day's work, I shall end the same to-morrow. I write all things, though they be of little weight. . . . I am in doing a work here that I hate greatly. Have you not desire to laugh to see me lie so well, at the least to dissemble so well, and to tell him truth so betwixt hands. He hath shown me all on the bishop's behalf, and on Sunderland, without touching any word to him of that which you showed me, but only by much flattering him, and praying him to assure himself of me. . . . You have heard the rest. We are tied to two false races . . . God forgive me. God knit us together for ever, for the most faithful couple that ever he united. This is my faith: I will die in it. Excuse if I write ill, you may guess the half of it, but I cannot mend it because I am not well at ease, and yet very glad to write unto you when the rest are sleeping. . . . I am weary and asleep, and yet cannot forbear scribbling as long as there is any paper.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 154.

There are many passages unfit for transcription, interspersed again with aspirations for God's blessing, and sentiments of shame at the course she is pursuing. The next day she continues her letter, beginning with speaking of a bracelet she is

making him (Bothwell), which he is to keep out of sight, and for the hasty workmanship of which she apologises, and then she remembers the loathed task in hand:—

‘I go to my tedious talk. You make me dissemble so much that I am afraid thereof with horror, and you cause me almost to do the office of a traitoress. Remember how, if it were not to obey you, I would rather be dead than do it. My heart bleeds at it.’—*Ibid.* p. 170.

And then another scene with her husband is detailed, in which she brought him round to her wishes:—

‘To be short, he will go anywhere upon my word. Alas, I never deceived anybody, but I remit myself wholly to your will, and send me word what I shall do, and whatsoever happen to me, I will obey you. Think also if you cannot find any more secret invention by medicine, for he is to take medicine at Craigmillar and the bath also. He may not come forth of the house this long time. To be short, by all that I can learn he is in great suspicion, and yet, nevertheless, trusts upon my word, but yet not so far that he will show anything to me. But, nevertheless, I shall draw it out of him if you will that I avow all to him. But I shall never be willing to beguile one who puts his trust in me, nevertheless you may do all, and do not esteem me the less for that cause, because for my own particular revenge I would not do it to him. . . . To conclude, for certainty he suspects of the thing you know and of his life. But as to the last, so soon as I spoke two or three good words to him, he rejoices and is out of doubt. I have not seen him this evening for finishing your bracelet, but I can find no clasp for it. It is ready for them, and yet I fear it should bring you ill-hap, or that it should be known if you are hurt. . . . Burn this letter, for it is over dangerous, and nothing well said in it, for I am thinking upon nothing but fasherie. . . . Now seeing, to obey you, my dear life, I spare neither honour, conscience, nor hazard, nor greatness; take it in good part and not after the interpretation of your false brother-in-law, to whom I pray you to give no credit against the most faithful lover that ever you had or shall have. See not also her (his wife) whose feigned tears you ought not more to regard than the true travails which I endure to deserve her place, for obtaining of which, against my own nature, I do betray those that would lett me. God forgive me, and give you, my only friend, the good luck and prosperity that your humble and faithful lover doth wish unto you, who hopeth shortly to be another thing unto you, for the reward of my pains.’—*Ibid.* vol. ii. Appendix, p. 146.

The other letters are in much the same strain. They are given in the same work at full length, and also the notes drawn from them by the English and Scotch commissions when the matter was brought before Elizabeth. There is something almost ludicrous, if it were not too revolting a subject for such feelings, in the gravity of these documents. We have, from a paper endorsed by Cecil, ‘A brief note of the chief and principall pointes of the Quene of Scottes lettres written to Bothaill, which may tend to her condemnation, for her consent and procurement of the murder of her husband, as farre forthe as we coulede by the reading gather,’ and by the Scotch commissioners a longer list coolly separating from the maze of love,

hatred, jealousy, and fantastic fancy, which agitated by turns the mind of the writer, such passages as bore on the matter in hand, and transcribing them in their uncouth Scotch translation, as for example—(we simplify the spelling):—

Item, "As to me, howbeit I hear no farther news from you, according to my commission; I bring the man with me to Craigmillar," (where it was at first planned to commit the murder,) on Monday, "where he will be all Wednesday." *Item*, very shortly after: "Summa, ye will say he (Darnley) makes the court to me, of the which I take so great pleasure that I enter never where he is, but incontinent I take the sickness of my side, I am so fashed with it. . . . I pray you advertise me of your news at length, and what I shall do in case ye be not returned when I come there, for, in case ye work not wisely, I see that the whole burden of this will fall upon my shoulders."

Item, "I pray you, according to your promise, to discharge your heart to me, otherwise I will think that my malheur and the good handling of her that has not the third part of the faithful nor willing obedience unto you that I bear has won, against my will, that advantage over me which the second love of Jason won; not that I would compare you to ane sa unhappy as he was, nor yet myself to ane sa unpitiful a woman as she. Howbeit ye cause me be somewhat like unto her in anything that touches you or that may preserve and keep you to her, to whom you only appertain, if it may be sure that I may appropriate that which is worn though faithful, yea only loving of you, which I do and shall do all the days of my life, for pain and evil that can come thereof."—*Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 215.

Mary seems to have entertained a great jealousy of Bothwell's wife. Like Cleopatra, she could not, in spite of her power and her matchless attractions, for one moment forget 'the married woman.' The sonnets abound in allusions to her: her 'false tears and feigned affection,' contrasting her own great sacrifices for him:—

*'Elle pour son honneur vous doit obeysance,
Moi vous obeysant j'en puis recevoir blasme;
N'estant, à mon regret, come elle vostre femme.'*¹

Third Sonnet. Laing, vol. ii. p. 224.

¹ Miss Strickland, in her self-sacrificing devotion to her heroine, summarily sets down all the letters of the casket as forgeries, in a series of arguments which have hardly any semblance of weight and authority when uncontradicted, but which fall to the ground the moment the other side is heard. She thinks the sonnets may have been in Mary's own writing, but because they do not contain any mention of Bothwell's name, suggests that they might have been the composition of some troubadour which she had copied before quitting France. Their apparent relevancy to the matter in hand, would, if this were the case, be one of the most perverse of the many perverse coincidences which Mary's advocates have to assert and to lament over. As conclusive of her views of forgery, she clenches the argument by adducing the following solitary testimony as to the public opinion of Mary's contemporaries. It is in a letter from La Motthe Fenelon, French ambassador to Catharine de Medicis. We cannot receive it as so entirely settling the question:—

'Truly, it is believed by those of the Queen's side, that these letters are false, and that those seen are suppositious and counterfeited; and that since their malice and subtlety has been great enough to dispossess a rightful queen of her crown, they would not stand at counterfeiting her hand; and also they allege that should their queen have done anything of the kind, she never would have done it, excepting under the magic compulsion and sorcery of the Earl of Bothwell, as he knew well

We could go on multiplying extracts and proofs of guilt, but our readers will think we have already given them too much on a most unprofitable theme. We can only assure them that, from respect to them and to our pages, we have refrained from some passages and allusions which are even more conclusive of her guilty hatred and guilty love, while, on the other hand, for what we have given, our apology must rest on our strong sense of the impropriety and mischief of bringing serious charges without also adducing proofs. No man has a right to take away or injure the character of another by his own unsupported word. Nor would we cast an additional slur on the dead without giving the causes and reasons that have influenced us.

The details of the murder we need not enter into; all know that Mary continued her attentions and endearments to the last. She had arranged, through 'Paris,' with Bothwell and Lethington, that the place was to be changed from Craigmillar, to which Darnley had expressed a dislike, to Kirk of Field, on the pretence of its pure air. Thither, when he was well enough to travel in a litter, she took him. Her power over him was truly a *fascination*; he did all she wished him, and yet he mistrusted her. 'I have fears enough,' he said to Thomas Crawford, his friend (whose account remains to us); 'but may God judge between us! I have her promise only to trust to; but I have put myself in her hands, and I shall go with her, though she should murder me.' The place was inconveniently small, and unsuited for such high guests; but Mary remained under the same roof with him, while Bothwell was making his arrangements for the murder. Here the help of Hubert, or, as he is called, French Paris, whom the Queen had just received from his service into her own, was necessary. The evidence of this man, which he gave before his execution, throws light upon the whole transaction, and has, of course, been doubted, but bears strong internal evidence of truth. It is given with a garrulous *naïveté*, as if he had really enjoyed easing his mind of his share of the matter. We need not say it is conclusive against the Queen. He seems to have wished to satisfy himself of her share in the work in hand; for when Bothwell bid him move the Queen's bed (her room was exactly under the king's, and her bed just under his), as the gunpowder was to be placed there, Paris neglected the order, and when Mary came into the room in the evening, she herself ordered him to change the position of the bed.

that trade, having made it his greatest occupation from the time he was at school, to read and study books of necromancy and forbidden magic.' Here it is observable that the writer does not give his own opinion at all, and next, seems to think that the Queen's friends laid more stress on the magic than the forgery, of which no proof, either here or at any time, is attempted. That must have been regarded as a very hopeless case that had recourse to such a defence.

¹ The Queen said to me, "Fool that you are, I will not have my bed in that place," and so made me remove it; by which words I perceived in my mind that she was aware of the plot. Thereupon I took courage to say to her, "Madam, my Lord Bothwell has commanded me to take to him the keys of your chamber, because he intends to do something in it, namely, (and this explanation is supposed to be to his examiners,) to blow up the King with gunpowder." "Do not talk about that at this hour," said she, "but do what you please." Upon this I did not venture to say anything more.—*Second Deposition of Paris. Mignet, vol. i. p. 264. Laing, vol. ii. p. 285.*

Her self-possession and regard for little things at that time, are amongst the most terrible traits of her character, and connect her in our minds with many of the world's great historic criminals: the well-known care for the new velvet bed, on the ground that it would be soiled by Darnley's bath, and the substitution of an old purple travelling-bed in its place; also, her great solicitude about a rich coverlet of fur which she would not have blown up along with her husband. The Queen remained with Darnley in his room on Sunday night, till those who were in the secret could hear the fatal sounds of preparations going on below, so that Bothwell came down to bid them make less noise. He returned to the King's room with Paris, a signal that all was ready; who had not been there but the 'length of a paternoster,' when the Queen, affecting to remember that she had promised to be present at a mask on the marriage of one of her servants, suddenly quitted the place, and left her victim to his fate.

² He beheld her departure with grief and secret fear. The unhappy prince, as though foreboding the mortal danger by which he was threatened, sought consolation in the Bible, and read the fifty-fifth Psalm, which contained many passages adapted to his peculiar circumstances. After his devotion, he went to bed and fell asleep, Taylor, his young page, lying beside him in the same apartment.—*Mignet, vol. i. p. 266.*

The noise of the explosion which followed awoke all Edinburgh. With what sound did it fall on Mary's ears, who, in the midst of her festivities, must have been listening and watching for it? This can never be known; we only know that the first person admitted to her presence afterwards was the murderer. At ten o'clock on the following morning, the news having been previously told her, she had got up all the external signs of mourning. Paris entered the Queen's chamber, from which the daylight was excluded, her bed, from which she had not yet risen, was hung with black, and one of her ladies was giving her her breakfast. Here Bothwell came in, and had a secret conference with her under the curtain. He soon left her, and reported to those without that the Queen was overwhelmed with grief. The day after, she sent the following cool account of the matter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador at Paris:—

¹ *Edinburgh, Feb. 10, 1567.*

'Most Reverend Father in God, and trusted Counsellor, we greet you well.

'We have received this morning your letters of the 27th of January, by your servant, Robert Drury, containing in one part sic advertisement as we find by effect over true, albeit the success has not altogether been sic as the authors of that mischievous fact had preconceived and had put it in execution; an if God in his mercy had not preserved us as we trust to the end, that we may take a rigorous vengeance of that mischievous deed, which ere it should remain unpunished we had rather lose life and all. The matter is so horrible and strange, as we believe the like was never heard of in any country.

'This night past, being the 9th of February, a little after two hours after midnight, the house wherein the king was lodged was, in one instant, blown into the air, he lying asleep in his bed, with sic a vehemency that of the whole lodging, walls and other, there is nothing remaining; na, not a stone above another, but all either carried far away or *dang* in dross to the very ground stone. It must be done by the force of gunpowder, and appears to have been a mine. By whom it has been done, or in what manner, appears not yet.

'We doubt not, but according to the diligence our council has begun already to use, the certainty of all shall be *usit* shortly, and the same being discovered, which we *woot* God will not suffer to lie hid, we hope to punish the same with sic rigour as shall serve for example of this cruelty to all ages to come. Always whoever has taken this wicked enterprise in hand we assure ourself it was dressit as well for ourself as for the king, (for we lay for the most part of all last week in that same lodging, and was there accompanied with the most part of the lords that were in this town) and that same night at midnight, and of very chance tarried not all night there by reason of some masks at the abbey (Holyrood): But we believe it was not chance but God that put in our head.

'We despatched this bearer upon the sudden; therefore write to you the more shortly. The rest of the letter we shall answer at more leisure within four or five days by your own servant. And so for the present we commit you to Allmighty God.

'At Edinburgh the 11th day of Feb. 1566-67.'—*Letters of Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. i. p. 44.

Mary, after the murder, manifested an uncommon dislike to the mention of Darnley's name, which is one of the nearest approaches to remorse that we can find in her. What she said to the Archbishop in this letter she maintained through life, when forced to speak of him at all. But though we see from this example that she did not affect to consider her feelings wounded by the event, there was something about the affair that she would rather keep out of sight. Is there anything in history more detestable than the whole of this letter? The coldness, the hypocrisy, the falsehood; and yet it was by her adherence in the course here first adopted that she, in fact,

¹ To this letter Miss Strickland appends the following extraordinary comment: 'If Mary had had any evil intentions against poor Darnley, she must have given some hint of them to her chief confidant the Archbishop, to whom this letter was addressed.'

gained over her adherents in her own and present times. Partly, it is hard to believe in that long subsequent life of impenitence; men are shaken, in spite of their reason, by consistent assertion and consistent denial. She would be too wicked if it were all true! So, as soon as the overwhelming evidence is a little shoved out of sight by other coming events, Mary gets the benefit of these misgivings and difficulties. But, in fact, her guilt is indefinitely increased by this obstinacy in it. Every good Christian ought to stand aghast at such a picture of impenitent sin. We are tempted here, though out of chronological order, to show our readers what is M. Mignet's mode of judging of character, and how far we are to value anything but his *facts*; and to begin with his just and fair notice of her conduct immediately after the murder:—

'What was the effect produced upon Mary Stuart by this terrible occurrence which filled Edinburgh with indignation and mistrust? She appeared overwhelmed with sorrow and fell into a state of silent dejection. She manifested none of that activity, anger, resolution, and courage which she had displayed after Riccio's murder: but shut herself up in her room, and would communicate with her most faithful servants by the medium of Bothwell alone. Darnley's murderer was the only person admitted to her presence. Even were we not furnished with the most unquestionable proofs of her complicity by the confessions contained in her letters, the authenticity of which we have established elsewhere, as well as by the declarations made in presence of their judges and upon the scaffold, by the subaltern actors in this tragic drama, her conduct both before and after the murder would suffice to convince us that she was a party to the crime.'—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 272.

He then recapitulates what we have already gone through, and continues:—

'But if her conduct previous to the commission of the crime thus deeply criminales Mary Stuart, what must we think of her proceedings after its perpetration? Her behaviour, both as a wife and a queen, render her guilt all the more flagrant, because far from avenging the husband upon whom she had so recently lavished her hypocritical caresses, she rewarded his murderer, and eventually married him.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 273.

Having thus established her guilt so entirely to his own and others' satisfaction, we must show our readers what is the occasion M. Mignet chooses for a burst of admiration for this wicked queen. We somewhat purposely anticipate the course of events, that our readers may not be tempted to the very common error, that distance of time softens unrepented sin; that is, that a criminal without an act of repentance is, in fact, by the mere passage of time, in some sort cleansed from his crime. We do not believe that M. Mignet could have expressed himself as he does in the following passage, had the scene he describes taken place within a week of Darnley's murder, instead of after a lapse of two years of deserved misfortune; and if, instead of some chapters'

change of subject, he had had to proceed to the recording of it before the ink of the last sentence was dry or the page turned over. When Mary took refuge in England, and was detained by Elizabeth, the charge of murdering her husband was brought against her by her own subjects, who supported the charge by producing the letters in the silver casket. Many hard words are applied to Elizabeth, for pressing for a direct answer; for urging Mary, in fact, to defend herself from the charge, giving her the choice of three separate modes of doing so.

‘ Mary declined this insidious request. She would not condescend to appear as the accused party. Adroit and courageous, sometimes perplexed but never cast down, she now displayed all the resources of her mind and all the energy of her character. After having tried every means to prevent the publication of the documents which criminated her; after having had recourse to the skilful manœuvres of Lethington and the prudent counsels of Norfolk; after having once offered to abdicate, and frequently to forgive, even when she was most grievously offended—she now stood up with all the dignity of a queen, and proved herself as bold as she had previously appeared accommodating. Instead of defending herself, she attacked Murray. On the 19th of December she wrote to her Commissioners: “Forasmuch as the Earl of Murray and his adherents our rebellious subjects, have added unto their pretended excuses, produced by them for colouring of their horrible crimes and offences committed against us their sovereign lady and mistress, the charge that, as the Earl of Bothwell was the principal executor of the murder committed on the person of Harry Stuart our late husband, so we knew, counselled, devised, persuaded, and commanded the said murder,—they have falsely, treacherously, and wickedly lied; maliciously imputing to us a crime of which themselves were authors and inventors, and some of them even executors.” Repelling the charge of having impeded the proceedings of justice against Darnley’s murderers, and of having given her consent beforehand to her marriage of Bothwell, she alluded with consummate ability and eloquence to the danger to which the lords declared that she had exposed her son: [she had in fact wished to give him into Bothwell’s hands.] “That calumny,” she pathetically observed, “should suffice for proof of all the rest. The natural love of a mother towards her bairn confounds them; but in the malice and impiety of their hearts, they judge others by their own affection.”’—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 53.

For our own part, so far are we from sharing in M. Mignet’s admiration of this unparalleled audacity, that we find ourselves on the contrary responding in a way we could not have anticipated, to Knox’s denunciations of the course and character of this woman; his language is strong, we do not defend a subject for using such language towards her who once at least was his sovereign; but our readers shall judge if it is not in most points deserved. It is from one of his sermons:—

‘ I am further accused, that I speak of their sovereign (mine she is not) as that she were reprobate, affirming that she cannot repent; thereto I answer, that the accuser is a calumniator and a manifest liar, for he is never able to prove that at any time I have said that she could not repent; but I have said, and yet say, that pride and repentance abide not in one

heart of any long continuance. . . . What I have spoken against the adultery, against the murders, against the pride, and against the idolatry of that wicked woman, I spake not as one that entered into God's secret counsel, but being one, of God's great mercy, called to preach according to His blessed will revealed in His Holy Word, I have oftener than once pronounced the threatenings of His law against such as have been of counsel, knowledge, assistance, or consent, that innocent blood should be shed."—*Tytler*, vol. vii. p. 287.

There is something in simple magnitude which attracts some minds; even a crime may be pardoned if it is only large enough and maintained with spirit enough. We have traced Mary's aptitude for so great a crime to her education in the Court of France, and to the principles which she imbibed there. The murder of Darnley and its consequences were direct fruits of those principles and of that teaching; and, as a remarkable confirmation of this view, we find the same teaching producing the very same results in France itself, only two years after. We need hardly remind the youngest or the most forgetful of our readers, that the Massacre of St. Bartholomew was designed and carried out by those who had especially the direction of Mary's education, Catharine de Medicis and the Cardinal of Lorraine; and by her fellow-pupils, Charles IX. and his brother, the Duke of Anjou. And in the crimes themselves there are many points of resemblance; in part arising from the dissimulation which is the feature and crowning aggravation of each; and also from the circumstances themselves, which in the domestic act of treachery anticipate on a small scale, and shadow forth, those of the more gigantic enormity. Nor are there wanting points of striking analogy in the minor personage. Each tragedy has its innocent, accidental victim. And the Lady Jane Gordon, forced to a divorce from her husband, represents Margaret of France, compelled to a marriage against her heart and feelings; each being equally gainers by the act of injustice and apparent cruelty. Mary represents the king and court of France; Darnley must stand for the Admiral and the Huguenot party; and the Kirk of Field is Paris.

Mary's open, impulsive, impetuous temper is sometimes brought forward to show her naturally incapable of an act of deliberate perfidy. But Charles's disposition might have been supposed quite as great an obstacle to his long-sustained effort of patient, watchful, insidious, profound dissimulation. Mary had only Darnley to delude; Charles was matched with Coligni and his party, able men, whose lives had been passed in suspicion, experienced in the arts of deception, and in the task of unmasking the covert designs of the most perfidious court in the world. Mary had but a few days of dissembling; Charles, for many months, might not relax nor indulge himself in one

natural outbreak. What must it not have cost a young king, absolute in position, impatient in temper, and utterly unscrupulous in principle, to maintain that long course of concession to his enemies, by which he at length gained his ends! from that first conference with his mother and the other conspirators, up to the successful issue of the plot formed there; the feigned peace,—the support of the Protestant religion, and severe repression of the outrages of his own party against it;—his affected displeasure with the House of Guise;—the disgrace into which he brought himself with his Catholic allies, Spain and the Pope, by a course which he could neither justify nor explain;—the connecting himself by the forced marriage of his sister with one of the detested heretics—the whole series of measures necessary to bring within his net the Huguenots whom he had resolved to exterminate. What unremitting watchfulness, what self-restraint were necessary: what sacrifices must be made to lull their jealous suspicions, what perpetual benignity of aspect veiling the smothered rage within, what toleration of high pretensions and bold demands must he persevere in!—but the end reconciled him to all. That it was an effort we know from that scene with his mother, when he believed her to have let out the plot, and he, on his side,

‘grievously complained to her that she should have made known those secrets, which he with so much patience, and resistance from his own mind, putting constraint on his natural disposition, had concealed; to which words the queen, smiling, replied that she did not need to learn from him the art of silence, bidding him to consider if he himself, by his own impatience, had not let out what he suspected others to have done.’¹

That he succeeded we know, not only from the result but from the *naïve* admiration Davila expresses for a crowning act of dissimulation by which he distinguished himself. This was on the occasion of Coligni’s arrival at Paris.

‘It was a notable thing (*cosa notabile*) to see the Admiral, grown old in ambitious pretensions and proud thoughts, now conscious in himself of his errors; all France for the theatre, and before the eyes of his own partisans; brought to so public a repentance, that he was seen with a copious effusion of tears, prostrated at the knees of that king whom he had so frequently offended; *but it was much more notable* that the king, so young in years, of a nature so precipitate and irascible, now seeing before him the man who had so often endangered his crown and dominion, knew how to dissemble so perfectly, that, calling him father and raising him with his own hands, he made every one believe him to be sincerely and entirely reconciled to him.’—*Davila*, vol. ii. p. 273.

Coligni’s attempted assassination, under the King’s orders, and the subsequent visit of affectionate condolence paid to the ed man by Charles and his mother, and the surrounding

¹ Davila’s ‘*Historia di Francia*,’ vol. ii. p. 269.

him with his own guard, in pretended care for his safety, are all points of analogy with Mary's course, which we need not dwell upon. Mary, it is true, eventually denied her share in the murder, and Charles avowed his; but he had designed to conceal it, depending upon a despairing insurrection of the Huguenots, which did not take place; so that the massacre was obliged to be a more orderly and deliberate affair than it had been planned to be. What lies were left to him to tell we need not say he did tell. Perhaps in one point Charles and his mother stand in honourable distinction from Mary, for she would have given up her infant son to the murderer of its father, if she could; and Catharine and her son, having connected themselves by the ties of blood to Henry of Navarre, found themselves almost, to their surprise, bound by them, so that they used exertions, and disoblged the Duke of Guise, in order to save him and his brother: an act of impolicy, according to Davila; who, treating the whole affair as a political coup d'état, remarks on the great mistake it is to mingle isolated acts of mercy with 'extreme measures.'

And now to return to our narrative. However anxious, for various motives, historians have been to release Mary from the actual guilt of her husband's death,—some from political, some from religious reasons; some from a chivalrous gallantry towards the sex, of which she was externally so fair an ornament, and some indulging the subtle intellectual pleasure of disputing obvious conclusions,—writers may be called unanimous in their admission that Mary did all she could by her subsequent conduct to attach the guilt to herself. Nothing could be more shameless, more blind to common decency, more utterly insensible, than the course into which she immediately plunged. Feeling no remorse, and expressing no sorrow, she was simply intoxicated by one sentiment. She cared for no one but Bothwell, and she allowed every individual in her kingdom to see that this was so. Never, we must say, was the principle of loyalty put to so terrible a test. While the whole world—not suspected, but—*knew* him to be the murderer, she would not endure him out of sight; while high and low felt the deed a national reproach, within a fortnight she was playing games, 'shooting at the butts with him at Seton, and forcing those 'lords who lost with them to pay the forfeit in a dinner.' Engaged in these becoming recreations, she took no active steps towards discovering her husband's murderers; her first care, on the contrary, was to reward various subordinate actors in it by places and pensions.' She had, it is true, on the 12th of

¹ Laing, vol. i. pp. 34—48.

February, offered a reward of £2,000 to any who would come forward with information—something must be done for the sake of appearances to foreign courts, and

‘ Scarcely was this made known, when public opinion gave voice to its convictions, and a paper was fixed during the night on the doors of the Tolbooth, or common prison, in which Bothwell, James Balfour, and David Chambers (another of Bothwell’s intimates) were denounced as guilty of the king’s slaughter. Voices, too, were heard in the streets of Edinburgh at dead of night, arraigning the same persons. A second placard charged the queen’s servants with the crime, and mentioned the names of Signor Francis, Bastian, John de Bourdeaux, and Joseph, David Rizzio’s brother. The Queen took no steps to secure the subaltern conspirators, and kept the greatest criminal of them all by her side.’—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 274.

No council was assembled, and nothing was done. Pictured placards appeared in public places:—the initials, M. R., holding a sword, and Bothwell’s, with another instrument of death. The Presbyterian ministers preached with ‘sombre vehemence,’ exhorting men to fasting and prayer, and calling on God ‘to reveal and revenge.’ The Queen’s complicity became more and more suspected. Bothwell rode into Edinburgh with an armed force, and bullied and threatened, but by his suspicious and guilty bearing, only confirmed men’s minds against him. Darnley’s father wrote pathetic letters, imploring Mary to take steps to discover the murderer; to which she returned affectionate but evasive answers. Elizabeth wrote to her, as *we* think, a very good and sensible letter, giving Mary the advice of a true friend, though Mignet characterises it very harshly: our readers shall judge. It is a specimen of the sort of language he always uses towards our great Queen.

‘ Elizabeth despatched a letter, by Sir Henry Killigrew, in which she hinted her suspicions of Mary’s implication in the murder, and displayed *the passionate hatred which she entertained against her*, in the vehemence of her ill-concealed reproaches, and the feigned character of her hypocritical condolence: “Madam,” she wrote, “my ears have been so astonished, and my mind so grieved, and my heart so terrified at hearing the horrible sound of the abominable murder of your late husband and my deceased cousin, that I have, even now, no spirit to write about it; and although my natural feelings constrain me greatly to deplore his death, as he was so near a relation to me, nevertheless boldly to tell you what I think, I cannot conceal from myself that I am more full of grief on your account than on his. O Madam! I should not perform the part of a faithful cousin and an affectionate friend, if I studied rather to please your ears than to endeavour to preserve your honour; therefore I will not conceal from you what most persons say about the matter, namely, that you will look through your fingers at taking vengeance for this deed, and have no intention to touch those who have done you this kindness, as if the act would not have been perpetrated unless the murderers had received assurance of your impunity. Think of me, I beg you, who would not entertain such a thought in my heart for all the gold in the world.” She then went on to urge her, in the strongest terms, not to leave so great a crime unpunished. “I exhort you,” she adds; “I advise and beseech you to take this thing so much to heart

as not to fear to bring to judgment the nearest relation you have, and to let no persuasion hinder you from manifesting to the world that you are a noble Princess, and also a loyal wife."—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 279.

Letters of condolence are proverbially difficult things, and should always be read with the tenderest indulgence. Who would desire his heart or his understanding to be tested by his own performances in this line? But we must say the difficulty is indefinitely increased when it seems probable, from circumstances, that the person addressed is herself the main cause of the catastrophe we deplore; while yet it would be as unjust as it would be discourteous, to charge our correspondent downright with the fact. Indeed, *suspicion* is all that is in the mind; we do not *believe*, we only misdoubt. So we think, on the whole, that Elizabeth did very well; and are only glad it does not fall to our lot to have such a correspondent. Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow and ambassador in France, writes in just the same strain; imploring her to use vigorous means to bring the offenders to justice; informing her that in France 'yourself' 'is greatly and wrongously calumniated to be the principal 'motive of the same;' conjuring her to take a rigorous vengeance, observing, 'that rather than it be not actually taken, it appears to me better, in this world, that you had lost life and all.' Mary, however, had sinned, and risked all, for the present—for present pleasure; this she would have, and was perfectly headstrong and bewitched in her methods of obtaining it. Therefore, when compelled to have Bothwell tried, she so managed, and used such palpable and manifest injustice, as still more to implicate herself and him. She utterly despised not only popular opinion, but every form of it. She had still some difficulties in the way of attaining her ultimate object; serious ones to most minds, but mere straws to her in her present disposition. First, Bothwell *must* be tried for Darnley's murder; secondly, he was already married to another woman; and, thirdly, her husband had been dead but a few weeks. She chose to overcome these obstacles in this order: Bothwell, himself ordering all the arrangements of his trial, and attended by four thousand armed men, loaded by her favours, supported by her public countenance, and mounted on the late king's favourite horse, presented himself for trial, and was tried and acquitted, no one appearing against him, and, as a sequel to this scene, he procured, by an act of bullying audacity, which was a lasting disgrace to the Scotch nobility, a bond signed by many of them, recommending his marriage with the queen. Next, she contrived with him the celebrated abduction to which some of the letters in the casket relate; a very barefaced piece of acting, by which she affected to show herself to her people a prisoner to Bothwell's

unprincipled violence, and her actions therefore no longer in her own power. This affair came off on the 24th of April; he met her with an armed force, as she was returning from a visit to her son, and taking her horse by the bridle, carried her off to the castle of Dunbar. While here, the divorce with his wife was effected;—in the Catholic courts, in behalf of Bothwell, through that consistorial court whose powers she had restored *before* the murder; in the Protestant, in behalf of Jane Gordon, his wife; his previous course of life furnishing sufficient ground. The sentence was pronounced on the 3d of May, and on that day Mary returned to Edinburgh with Bothwell by her side, where she declared his pardon not only for the late outrage on herself, but *for all other offences*, and announced her intention of marrying him. Although this had long been expected, it filled the country with furious indignation; no fair words or promises could silence the Presbyterian ministers in their denunciations, Craig refused to publish the banns till the law compelled him, and then added from the pulpit these words: ‘I take heaven and earth to witness that I abhor and detest this marriage as odious and slanderous to the world, and I would exhort the faithful to pray earnestly that a union against all reason and good conscience may yet be overruled by God to the comfort of this unhappy realm.’ Nothing daunted, Mary, on the 12th of May, created Bothwell Duke of the Orkneys and Shetland, and placed the coronet on his head with her own hands. On the 15th she was married.

From this period date Mary’s *misfortunes*, as they are always called; that is, being permitted to attain the object for which she had sinned, she was not allowed to enjoy it with impunity. From that moment vengeance and retribution opened on their pursuit, nor once lost sight of their victim till she paid the forfeit of her crime with her own blood. And this should never be forgotten by those who read her subsequent history. It is true that Mary, who had made a mockery of law and justice when it suited her purpose, suffered in her turn from the neglect of their requirements. But we must never say that Mary suffered unjustly. We may charge Elizabeth with harshness and duplicity; she may have erred, and did err, in assuming rights she did not possess; but Mary’s punishment was not the less, as far as she is concerned, a just one.

The very day of her marriage she had a quarrel with her husband; he seems to have discovered that the best mode of sustaining her affection was to be continually testing it. He was rough and harsh in his demeanour, suspicious, jealous, exacting, and it was her pleasure, while her affection lasted, to submit to all this. Her letters to him previous to the marriage

are in an abject strain of deprecation. 'Refuse me not, dear life, and suffer me to make some proof by my obedience, my faithfulness, constancy, and *voluntary subjection*.' 'I would I were dead, for I see all goeth ill . . . Absence hath power over you, who have two strings to your bow' [another wife]. 'I desire not but sudden death, and to testify unto you how lowly I submit myself unto your commandments. I have sent you in sign of *homage*,' &c. It was a favourite form with Mary to wish herself dead, as we see in these letters; on her wedding day she was heard to call for a knife 'to stick herself, or else,' she added, 'I shall drown myself.' She was, in fact, subject to paroxysms of rage, when things were going very ill indeed with her, though ordinarily her temper was not at fault; and now Bothwell was interfering with her freedom of action. 'Even since the day of her marriage,' wrote Du Croc to Catharine de Medici, 'she has passed her time in nothing but tears and lamentation, as he (Bothwell) will not give her liberty to look at any one, or allow any one to look at her although he knows that she loves to take her pleasure and pass her time agreeably, as much as any one.' However, these were only lovers' quarrels, from which they were soon aroused by the serious aspect of their affairs. A formidable league had been formed against them, of the chief nobility; nor should the anxiety of the court of France to join them be forgotten, as it was a fact very likely to influence Mary in her final choice of an asylum.

'In fact, the court of France, seeing that Mary Stuart multiplied the commission of degrading disorders and destructive errors, and fearing that Scotland might thereby fall under the dominion of England, had preferred to abandon the Queen rather than lose the kingdom. Charles IX. sent Villeroy to Du Croc with secret instructions, from which we extract the following curious passage:—"The said Sieur de Villeroy will say that his Majesty having made known to him the opinion which he entertains of the pitiable success of the affairs of the Queen of Scotland, seeing what has been written to him of her behaviour by the said Sieur du Croc, and the strange news which he has received from other quarters; and being also concerned that the enterprise of the said lords is secretly assisted and favoured by the English—whose charity would only entail their ruin—the King wishes the said Sieur du Croc to know, that the desire and principal intention of his Majesty is to keep the kingdom of Scotland in its attachment to himself, without permitting it, under the pretext of the many follies which are committed, to rebel and alienate itself from its attachment to himself, as it is certain it would do, towards the said English, whom the said lords would seek as their protectors in this affair, if they saw they would have no assurance from the King." It appears that Du Croc, in conformity with these instructions, offered the confederate lords a company of men-at-arms, and pensions to several noblemen and gentlemen.'—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 307.

But the confederates preferred to have the support of Eliza-

beth. And here began her difficulties—and very genuine ones they were throughout, though not always creditable ones. Her feelings and principles were entirely opposed to rebellion, under any circumstances. She was sincerely shocked at the thought of deposition—it was a personal question with her; and also at subjects standing up in judgment on their princes' faults. On the other hand, all respect for Mary must have been at an end; it was not possible to regard as sacred the rights of such a woman, and it would never do to allow France to get so powerful a hold upon Scotland as was threatened. So Mignet, after reflections on her tortuous policy, and on actions rarely corresponding with words, concludes with Cecil's promise to the lords, to make his mistress's feelings subordinate to her interests, and to lead her, slowly but surely, to adopt those resolutions which were least agreeable but most advantageous. Mary at first despised the threatened danger, but was soon compelled to view it in a more serious light; and just a month from the date of her marriage, we find her taking the field in person, 'mounted ' on horseback, preceded by the royal standard of Scotland, and ' dressed in a red gown which reached only to her knees.' The confederates hearing of her intrenching herself on Carberry hill, advanced from Edinburgh to give her battle, bearing a banner on which was painted the body of the murdered King lying under a tree, with the young Prince kneeling beside it, and underneath, the motto, '*Judge and avenge my cause, O Lord!*' The sight of this banner greatly moved the people, animated the confederate soldiers, and affected the loyalty of the Queen's men. At this crisis Du Croc attempted to effect a compromise, but he found the Queen very resolute and animated, and not at all willing for a compromise, though she promised pardon on their submission. Then followed proposals for settling the affair by single combat. Bothwell was ready to fight for his cause, and on the other side there were contentions for the office of champion; but in the meanwhile desertion began amongst her own troops, and Mary at length found herself forced to treat with her rebel subjects; and she agreed to deliver herself up to the confederates if they would allow Bothwell to escape; they in their turn promising, on condition of his dismissal, to return to their allegiance. And thus Mary took leave of her husband, probably with the hope of soon being rejoined by him. They were observed to speak together with much agitation, and then to separate 'with great anguish and grief.' Bothwell asked the Queen whether she would keep the promise of fidelity which she had made to him, of which she assured him, and gave him her hand upon it. Thereupon he mounted his horse, with a small company of about a dozen of his friends,

‘and went off at a gallop, taking the road to Dunbar.’ She never saw him again.

Mary’s love was not of a nature to bear a long absence, nor was he an object for pure attachment; yet for a few weeks or months she clung obstinately to him, after which time his remembrance, for all we know, passed away from her. She got engaged in other plots, and had new objects, to whom she must at least pretend to give her interest. He disappears from the scene till, eight or nine years after, we again come upon the mention of his name. Our readers will remember Bothwell’s fate;—that he turned pirate, was captured by a Norwegian vessel, and kept prisoner in Norway till 1576, when he died mad. However, there was a rumour of a confession, and Mary thus writes on the event to her ambassador at Paris:—

‘I have been informed of the death of the Count of Bothwell, and that before his decease he made an ample confession of his faults, and declared himself the author and guilty of the assassination of the late king my husband, of which he frees me, expressly swearing upon the damnation of his soul for my innocence, &c.’—*Laing*, vol. ii. p. 307.

She bids Beton, therefore, try to procure this confession. He in his turn, coldly answers that he had heard of it long ago, and that it had given her son great joy, but that he could not procure an authentic copy without money for the messenger’s journey, to which Mary (who really never wanted money) replies coolly enough—‘It seems to me that the journey of Monceaux (her messenger) is not necessary for this purpose, as from what you tell me the Queen-mother has sent:’ and so the authentic copy never came.¹ But this is a peep into the cold future. Mary, after this parting, gave herself up to the confederates, from whom she received a loyal and courteous reception; but on seeking to communicate with the Hamiltons, who had collected a body of men in her cause, she found herself no longer a queen, but a prisoner. The confederates feared a renewal of the war, and the recal of Bothwell, and would not permit her to hold correspondence with her partisans. Upon this she first realized her position, and giving way to most impolitic but not unnatural anger, exhibited all the ‘rage, resentment, and despair,’ especially attributed to

‘Youthful kings in battle seized alive,

and for once forgot both policy and dissembling. She called for Lindsey, and bade him give her his hand. He obeyed.

¹ Upon this Laing is certainly justified in saying ‘The testament is a shallow forgery, of which Mary and Beton were both conscious; and Bothwell himself, as he died mad, was incapable of a genuine confession at his death.’—*Laing*, vol. ii. p. 51.

'By the hand,' said she, 'which is now in yours, I'll have your head for this.' Morton and Athol she threatened to 'hang and crucify,' with other impotent threats which only served to widen the breach by showing the use she would make of power should she ever be suffered to regain it. However, Mr. Fraser Tytler admires her spirit, quoting her really effective promise of vengeance to Lindsey, and keeping in the background the wilder fury of her threats of crucifixion. He thus describes her miserable entrance into her capital. He is disgusted with her people's reception of her, and their indignation expresses itself no doubt in a sufficiently barbarous mode. The passage is remarkable to us as containing some evidence of remorse. It was the consciousness of her crime alone which caused her despair. A most wretched picture it is:—

'It was now evening, and the Queen, riding between Morton and Athol, was conducted to the capital, where she awoke to all the horrors of her situation. She was a captive in the hands of her worst enemies. The populace, as she rode through the streets, received her with yells and execrations; the women, pressing round, accused her in coarse terms as an adulteress stained with her husband's blood; and the soldiers, unrestrained by their officers, kept constantly waving before her eyes the banner on which was painted the murdered King, and the Prince crying for vengeance. At first they shut her up in the provost's house, where she was strictly guarded. It was in vain she remonstrated against the breach of faith; in vain she implored them to remember she was their sovereign; they were deaf to her entreaties, and she was compelled to pass the night, secluded even from her women, in solitude and tears. But the morning only brought new horrors. The first object which met her eyes was the same dreadful banner, which, with a refinement of cruelty, the populace had hung up directly opposite her window. The sight brought an agony of despair and delirium, in the midst of which she tore the dress from her person, and forgetting that she was almost naked, attempted in her frenzy to address the people.'—*Tytler*, vol. vii. 113.

But we will not pursue the familiar course of history—her imprisonment at Lochleven, her obstinate adherence to Bothwell, the discovery of the casket, the threatened trial by her own subjects, from which she was preserved by Elizabeth; the forced abdication,—drawn from her, there is good reason to believe, by the knowledge of the fatal evidence that existed against her;—her escape, the final battle, her flight into England, and the life of imprisonment which followed. Mary's history had events enough in it to furnish excitement for a very long life; what then must have been the tumult of existence in which her six years in Scotland were past? Within *seven* years she had had three husbands, and had been queen of two kingdoms; had headed campaigns in person; had suppressed insurrections and outwitted statesmen, subdued enemies, fought battles; had found time in these severe occupations for all the delights of society and for every form of amusement; she had had innumerable

admirers, and had experienced every gradation of sentiment, from simple coquetry to the most enthralling passion; she had known too the darkest excitements of conspiracy and crime:—always changing scene, and place, and occupation; riding, hunting, dancing, fighting, alternating from failure to triumph, from success to despair, and sustained through all by high spirits, reckless courage, and indomitable pride. What recollections, what habits, what dispositions and character were these with which to plunge suddenly into the monotony of a lifelong imprisonment!

That truly must have been a strong spirit which never once failed or yielded under the trial,—which for twenty years planned, and schemed, and flattered, plotted, conspired, cajoled, and we must add, *lied* with unabated energy and unflagging hope; and this under the consciousness of a great crime, and the, to her, heavier consciousness that all with whom she had to deal knew and were fully persuaded of her guilt. What bold bad woman was it who said, '*Une femme comme moi n'est jamais compromise?*' This must have been Mary's confidence, a trust in resources which could not be exhausted—a belief that if she could only see men, she could win them—a knowledge of the power of her very remarkable position and her lofty pretensions. There was another thing, too, to sustain her in captivity.

Writers talk much of Elizabeth's hatred of Mary. We believe Mary's feeling towards Elizabeth was a much deeper one. Elizabeth hated Mary,¹ (we take it for granted, as so many say so,) because she was a thorn in her side, the pretender to her throne, her prisoner whom she dare not set at liberty, and yet could plead no just right to detain; one who was perpetually putting her to difficulties; a load on her fears, on her conscience, and on her credit. But Mary hated Elizabeth, because

¹ Mr. Frazer Tytler quotes a reported message of Elizabeth to Cecil at the time when Mary was a prisoner at Lochleven, and in danger of her life from the vengeance of her subjects, which we think points to her general state of mind towards her, and proves that her 'hatred' was not proof against pity for her condition, nor against the accusations of conscience for her own want of strict integrity in her dealings with her. 'Tell Cecil that he must instantly write a letter, in my name, to my sister, to which I will set my hand, for I cannot write it myself, as I have not used her well and faithfully in these broken matters that be past. The purport of it must be to let her know that the Earl of Murray never spoke defamedly of her for the death of her husband, [it was before any communication could have reached Elizabeth from him on the subject of the casket,] never plotted for the secret conveying of the Prince into England, never confederated with the lords to depose her: on the contrary, and in my sister's misery let her learn from me this truth, and that is, that she has not a more faithful and honourable servant in Scotland.'—*Tytler*, vol. vii. p. 130.

There is nothing mysterious or unfathomable in this. No triumph in her rival's misery, but a natural revulsion of feeling towards her.

she knew she was known and despised by her, because her crimes had put her in her power, and even more because she was something to think of, and some one on whom to lay the blame for her misfortunes, diverting the train of bitter thought from herself. She was an object for revenge, some one to plot against, to hope against, to ruin if she could. Elizabeth in the multiplicity of her affairs could think only occasionally of Mary. Elizabeth was the barrier, the ultimate end and thought of every scheme of Mary's.

We have already alluded to the examination of Mary's letters to Bothwell. Our limits forbid our entering into the really interesting details of their production. All the astutest wits of the two kingdoms were engaged on this question. It was an encounter of wits, and all parties, it must be admitted, showed more cleverness than honesty;—Mary and her commissioners scheming, promising, negotiating, to prevent their being produced,—Murray and his party, alive to the advantages which might accrue to them by acceding to this wish, wise, cautious, guarded, alert,—Elizabeth and her ministers, on whom Mignet heaps an endless amount of virtuous vituperation, more than a match for both parties, and selfishly alive to the advantages to be derived to her cause by bringing them to the light. All those who are most lavish of abuse on Elizabeth, are candid at least in the admission of the extreme difficulty and peril of her situation. It must never be forgotten that Mary had asserted her right to the throne of England, and that there were foreign powers to support her right at any fitting opportunity. France and Spain only needed a favourable moment on their side, or a crisis in English affairs, to interpose in the Catholic cause. It was only Elizabeth's matchless genius and vigilance which preserved her country from such a crisis. What, then, was to be done with Mary? She could not be sent back to Scotland without an army to support her cause, and surely none who believes in Mary's guilt requires this from Elizabeth's generosity. And if she had been permitted to retire to France, it was giving the party most opposed to Elizabeth on religious grounds a weapon of which persons perhaps hardly realize the importance. Mary's gifts of person and mind also made her all the more formidable. Elizabeth, on her arrival in England, had sent envoys to receive her, whose report of the beautiful fugitive was somewhat of the same character and import as that of the spies of old times: 'We found her,' they said, 'in her answers to have an eloquent tongue and a discreet head; and it seemeth by her doings that she hath strict courage and liberal heart joined thereto.' This was an alarming account of the woman who had asserted superior claims against her, and whom she

knew to be wicked and unscrupulous in a desperate degree. She must have known, as we all know, that Mary was not to be believed or trusted. M. Mignet is absurdly indignant against Elizabeth for refusing to see Mary till her character was cleared. 'When the envoys,' he says, 'had informed her (Mary) of the hypocritical regret and offensive refusal of their mistress, Mary Stuart, with tears in her eyes, sorrowfully complained,' &c.; but in this our queen was certainly justified, and it cannot be denied that it was of importance to Elizabeth to have the guilt she fully believed in proved against her rival. This point, which it was more her interest to attain than even Murray's, she brought about as far as suited her purpose, though her respect for royalty prevented her publicly pronouncing the judgment arrived at. And having put some of the leading Roman Catholic lords on her commission, she secured that they should be aware of Mary's true character. Had Mary not been what she was, we do not believe Elizabeth would have detained her a prisoner. We are not justifying her for thus constituting herself her judge, but all must see that it is a different degree of error to oppress an innocent person and a guilty one. Elizabeth kept Mary prisoner because it suited her interest—because she dare not let her go. But while she probably knew in her heart that *she* had no right to do this, she could take comfort at least in the conviction that Mary deserved it.

Amongst those convinced of the authenticity of the letters was the Duke of Norfolk, though ambition afterwards so far overcame all decency of feeling that he would have married Mary, as he did rebel for her, and was one of the many victims in her cause. Elizabeth had very early charged him with the projected marriage, when 'he did with great oaths deny it, and added, Why should I seek to marry so wicked a woman, such a notorious adulteress and murderess? I love to sleep upon a safe pillow. . . . Besides, knowing as I do, that she pretendeth a title to the present possession of your majesty's crown, if I were about to marry her, your majesty might justly charge me with seeking to take your own crown from off your head.' In spite of these professions, in less than three years we find him reviving the plan of marriage, organizing with the Roman Catholic party a general insurrection, and 'plotting on the continent with the pope and the King of Spain to change the religion and overthrow the government.' He was found guilty, and previously to his execution spoke with great bitterness of the syren who had led him to his present misery.

'He sayeth very earnestly with vow to God, that if he were offered to have that woman in marriage, to chose that or death, he had rather take this

death that he is going to, a hundred parts: and he takes his Saviour to witness of this. He sayeth that nothing that anybody goeth about for her prospereth, nor that else she doth herself; and also that she is openly defamed.'—*Letter from Henry Skipwith to Dr. Burghley, 16th Feb. 1572. Mignet, vol. ii. p. 159.*

In spite of the tears Mary wept for Norfolk, we believe he was more sincerely lamented by the queen he conspired against. She most unwillingly suffered his execution. She could not sleep while the question was pending, and wrote bitterly to Mary for having seduced him from his allegiance. His treason being manifest, the House of Commons and her ministers urged his death, and even ventured to demand that of Mary, her life being, they said, incompatible with the safety of the kingdom; they said that the axe must be laid at the root of the tree, but Elizabeth replied, 'She could not put to death the bird which to 'escape the pursuit of the hawk had fled to her feet for protection.' So Norfolk died; and Mary lived to 'betray more men.'

Foreign archives reveal how great had been Elizabeth's danger in the recent conspiracy. The rebels were in communication with Alva, the King of Spain, and the pope; the object being to restore the Roman Catholic religion in England. Norfolk and Mary had asked for arms, ammunition, money, and an army of ten thousand men. Recent discoveries have brought to light a long letter of twenty pages from Alva to Philip on this subject, in which he enters warmly into the plan, but is afraid of Elizabeth's vigilance, and suggests her assassination under the following significant form; 'If the Queen of England 'should die either a natural death or any other death, or if her 'person should be seized without your Majesty's concurrence, 'then I should perceive no further difficulty.' Ridolfi, the messenger of the conspirators, is also charged with letters to the pope, and is the bearer of letters from him to Philip, earnestly entreating Spanish intervention in the plot.

'On the 7th of July, Ridolfi was questioned at the Escurial regarding the enterprise which he had come to propose by the Duke of Feria, whom Philip had deputed to hear his statements. His answers were written down in the handwriting of Zayas, the secretary of state. It was proposed to murder Queen Elizabeth. Ridolfi said that the blow could not be struck in London, because that city was the stronghold of heresy; but while she was travelling; and that a person named James Graffs had undertaken the office. On the same day, the council of state commenced its deliberations upon the proposed assassination of Elizabeth, and conquest of England. The subject of the discussion was, whether it behoved the King of Spain to agree with the conspirators "to kill or capture the Queen of England," in order to prevent her from marrying the Duke of Anjou, and putting to death the Queen of Scotland; whether the blow should be struck while she was travelling, or, which would be easier still, when she was at the country-house of one of the conspirators, who had surrounded her with persons on

whom they could depend; and whether they ought not to be assisted in case they carried out their intentions, which they would not do without the orders of the Catholic King. The councillors of state severally gave their opinions, which were committed to writing, and have been preserved to this day. The Duke of Feria spoke first. "Under present circumstances," he said, "the affair is embarrassing, but the Catholic King must not postpone it. The Queen of Scotland is *the true heir* to the realm of England, and she will rightly discharge the duties of religion and friendship towards us. If we allow her to be crushed, we entail destruction on all those that are devoted to her. The proximity of the Duke of Alva greatly facilitates the matter, and not an instant must be lost if we intend to engage in the enterprise."—*Mignet*, vol. ii. p. 144, from the *Archives of Simancas Inghilterra*, fol. 823.

The Duke of Feria, who gives this unscrupulous counsel, had been engaged in very different relations towards Elizabeth, as he was the ambassador chosen by Philip to offer his hand to her on her accession to the English throne. All the council gave their different suggestions. The Inquisitor-General voted that the sum of 200,000 crowns should be placed in Alva's hands, and that he should proceed in conformity with the declaration made by the pope's bull; he added that Ciapino Vitelli had offered to go in person with a dozen or fifteen resolute men to seize the Queen of England in one of her pleasure-houses, and that he would present himself before her under the pretext of demanding justice; but the Duke of Feria, profiting by his English experience, did not think it would be easy for a dozen men to capture the Queen of England. How extraordinary these deliberations sound in our ears! how strange that they should exist to this day to convict the authors of them! how wonderfully was Elizabeth's life hedged about and defended from the mischief that walketh in darkness! Mary and Elizabeth were both bold women, but if we must admire the natural virtue of courage, we admire it much the most in Elizabeth. It is impossible to contemplate her situation,—the dangers open and concealed by which she was surrounded throughout her reign, and which her wise and vigilant nature kept her constantly conscious of,—and not be affected and stirred by her lion-like bearing and invincible resolution. What a train of secret treasons and open aggressions does not her history lay before us, from the vacillating treachery of Norfolk, the interminable plots of Mary, the atrocious deliberations of Spain, down to the last mighty effort of her enemies against her. It is in contrasting her with these enemies that we see her greatness; and in comparing her with Philip, or the pope, or Charles, or Mary, we are tempted to forget her many not easily forgotten faults; and for a moment she stands as nobly distinct and magnanimous as when her poet's fancy drew her the

'Fair vestal thrond in the West.'

All these detestable deliberations preceded but a little while the massacre of S. Bartholomew, which might well infuse a universal suspicion on the great acknowledged heads of the Roman Catholic cause. It decided Elizabeth to detain Mary in perpetual captivity. The two Houses of Parliament went further in their 'hatred and fanaticism,' and wished to proceed against her by a bill of attainder, which Elizabeth suppressed by proroguing parliament. But a commission was sent down to Mary to interrogate her on the Norfolk conspiracy. 'The answers,' says Mignet, 'were more prudent than sincere;' the nearest approach to a censure of her habits of unscrupulous falsehood that we can remember to have met with in his work. However, he is at one time ashamed for his heroine: when, finding all other means fail, and her spirit really subdued by loss of adherents, stricter confinement, and the failure of plots, she begins to flatter Elizabeth, and makes pretty knick-knacks for her; employing her uncle, the cardinal, to send little articles of *vertù* from France which might please the English queen, and busying herself in ordering gold lace and silver spangles to make a head-dress for Elizabeth, which she is overjoyed at her accepting. Mary must be doing something for her cause, and she knew that when anything new occurred, these delicate attentions need not stand in the way of more congenial designs; accordingly, on turning over a page or two, we find her deep in new negotiations with Philip, who must have been a very provoking ally,—so slow and ponderous in his movements, promising much, ready to listen to all propositions, but spoiling all by delay. This new negotiation is remarkable for the use she made of her son, to which we call the reader's attention, not because they resulted in anything, but as bearing upon one of the most impressive scenes previous to her execution.

'He (Philip) would not suffer himself to be tempted by the offer which Mary Stuart made to place her son in his hands, and which was somewhat difficult of realization, although she continually recurred to it. Nor was this the only offer she made: after having proposed to place her son, as a hostage for Catholicism, in the hands of Philip II., Mary Stuart went so far as to contemplate his disinheritance by the transfer of all her rights to the powerful defender of her religion in Europe. Her frequent attacks of illness, the dangers which beset her captivity, and the consequences which might result from her plots, led her to project a will containing the following clause, which, though doubtless very Catholic, is certainly very unmaternal, and quite as unmonarchical. "In order," she says, "not to contravene the glory, honour, and preservation of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church, in which I wish to live and die, if the Prince of Scotland, my son, shall be brought back to its creed in spite of the bad education he has received, to my great regret, in the heresy of Calvin, among my rebellious subjects, I leave him the sole and only heir of my kingdom of Scotland, and of the right which I justly claim to the crown of England and its dependent countries; but if, on the other hand, my said son continues to

live in the said heresy, I yield, and present, and transfer all my rights in England and elsewhere . . . to the Catholic King or to any of his relations whom he may please, with the advice and consent of his Holiness, and this I do not only because I perceive him to be now the only true supporter of the Catholic religion, but also out of gratitude for the many favours which I and my friends, recommended by me, have received from him."—*Mignet*, vol. ii. p. 198. *Labanoff*, vol. iv. p. 354.

This will was written in February, 1577. Now we find her in the pathetic scene which preceded her death, on the very way to the scaffold,—that occasion on which so much of the interest in her character is founded,—expressing herself to Melvil in the following words:—

'Bear these tidings that I die firm in my religion, a true Catholic, a true Scotchwoman, a true Frenchwoman. May God forgive those who have sought my death! The Judge of the secret thoughts and actions of men knows that I have always desired the union of Scotland and England. Commend me to my son, and tell him that I have never done anything that could prejudice the welfare of the kingdom, or his quality as king, nor derogated in any respect from our sovereign prerogative.'—*Mignet*, vol. ii. p. 360.

She was false to the last. Our space fails us, nor yet is it needful to enter into the endless train of plots which the peculiar circumstances of the time engendered. The Roman Catholic party in England, oppressed and kept down, were ready to enter into any scheme. The Jesuits in the foreign seminaries were as unscrupulous in the means they sanctioned as their worst enemies could assert them to be. Philip had money for all Elizabeth's enemies, and had a host of pensioners. Bigotry and treason supplied men willing to take the active part in assassination. Mary, under the strict surveillance of Sir Amias Paulet, could no longer plot with them as freely as before, but her willingness to fall in with the most desperate measures was perfectly understood. But while the science of plotting and conspiracy was thus developed, Elizabeth's ministers on their side were growing still more skilful in the arts of detection, and very mean arts indeed they often were, and what in the present system of division of labour would be held very derogatory to the character of a gentleman. Though in these purer days we venture to guess that men in office are not curious to inquire *how* intelligence is gained, and criminals brought to justice.

In Elizabeth's time her ministers were their own police, and seem to have felt a genuine relish for unearthing a conspiracy, outwitting plotters, and counter-plotting, to make them convict themselves. They were weary of Mary, the whole of Protestant England desired her death—they verily believed her deserving of it, and felt that neither Elizabeth's nor their own lives were safe while she lived. Under these circum-

stances did Walsingham make the use he did of Babington, Ballard, Morgan, and the rest, and allowed Mary again such apparent liberty of action as to be able to enter into the plot they had formed; and by means of a double-dyed traitor, Gifford, she was entrapped into a correspondence with the conspirators, in which she warmly entered into a Spanish invasion, and renewed her promise to make Philip her heir; and upon Babington communicating to her the scheme for Elizabeth's assassination, she gave it her consent. Every letter she wrote or received had passed under Walsingham's eyes, who seems to have had no scruples or repugnance to the means he employed or the agents he worked by. We must regard such devices with abhorrence, but our censures of Walsingham are no sort of exculpation of Mary. She was a free agent, and voluntarily wrote what was brought as proof of her complicity in the plot. She had no scruples in doing so; we can hardly expect her to have them, when Philip, without her provocations, so warmly entered into the scheme, extremely commending Mary for having subordinated her love for her son to the service of God and of Christendom, and regarded the six gentlemen who were to murder Elizabeth as under the protection of God. As soon as the conspiracy was ripe, Walsingham laid before the Queen the plans for the invasion of her kingdom and her own assassination, which he justly thought likely means to bring her to the desired point; the suddenness, the wide extent of the plot, her own imminent peril and that of her country did produce fear, and altered her purposes, and in some way her state of feeling towards Mary. Elizabeth, on the question of the trial, the sentence, and the part which then fell on herself, and which she could not evade,—the signing of the death-warrant,—showed unequivocal dissimulation, a dissimulation which we despise. But this is not incompatible with true feeling, and may often be seen working with it. All her prejudices were against putting a queen to death; her principles were on one side, her personal danger and what she might well plead as necessity on the other; and while she wished to be rid of Mary, she very sincerely detested having to do it. Vacillating counsels constantly look like dissembling, but it seems certain that her ministers were really afraid of not being able to bring her to the point, and braved her displeasure at the last with an air of being more really apprehensive than subsequent writers upon the event seem to realize. Elizabeth was not sanguinary; compared with her times and with the example of her fellow-sovereigns, she was even merciful, and frequently showed a very remarkable forbearance towards her enemies, and a magnanimity for which she does not get sufficient praise. As an instance, Mary at one

time in a fit of passion wrote an insulting letter to Elizabeth, incompatible we should say with any delicacy, not to say decency of mind, pretending to repeat a number of gross slanders uttered against Elizabeth by the Countess of Shrewsbury. There is no doubt about the genuineness of the letter, Labanoff has seen it and vouches for this; but he and M. Mignet think it probable that the letter never reached Elizabeth, for no other reason that we can see but that she never took any notice of it or avenged it, as it was in her power to do. But our concern is with Mary, not with that strange compound of great and little qualities,—of what is admirable and (must we say) despicable?—of magnanimity, tinctured, as Hume expresses it, with ‘malignity,’—of genius, wisdom, prudence, penetration, foresight, vanity, and coquetry, our English queen; who, however far we must abate our admiration and temper our respect with opposing sentiments, must yet be acknowledged for one of the greatest women, and beyond this, one of the greatest sovereigns that ever lived.

The history of Mary's death, when considered in relation to her life, is very remarkable. Doubtless she conducted herself with great grandeur, with an undaunted courage, and what is more, with seeming Christian resignation. Her last hours were calculated to make a great impression on all who witnessed them. But yet we are forced to the conviction that it was a scene, that she was consciously *acting* before the present spectators, and before posterity, for to the very last she was asserting with every circumstance of solemnity, things that were not *true*, in regard both to her son and to Elizabeth. It was probably impossible for bystanders not to believe her in that solemn hour,—at least, those who interrupted the awful pageant with their mistimed doubts, get set down for brutal fanatics—witnessing her dignified composure, her unshaken courage, her religious deportment; but irrefragable evidence proves that what she so emphatically denied was yet true—that with an unflinching constancy, for no other purpose but to sustain her credit and to die grandly, she was false to the last—that she entered the presence of God with a lie in her right hand. It is startling to write such things, it is terrible to believe them, but history leaves us no other course. M. Mignet, who details with enthusiastic admiration Mary's last hours, has by the whole tenor of his previous facts taught his readers to shudder where he himself sees ground for reverence and the most excited praise. Such courage, such constancy in the very face of death, were genuine. It is evident that she thought herself a martyr, that she believed she died in God's favour and for His cause, and yet the wicked habit of her life stuck to her. Truth and purity had never been any part of her religion, her

moral sense, tainted at its source, was utterly depraved. She did not know God as a hater of evil. The Church for which she thought she died was—as *she had known it* from her cradle to her grave—evil and corrupt. She had been inured to see its wickedness in high places—she knew it under no better aspect. She was the martyr, not of the Church Catholic, nor yet of the Church of Rome, but of its corruptions. It was those corruptions which misled her through life, it was those corruptions which held back remorse and terror at her death, and enabled her to die as she had lived, dauntless and heroical in a bad cause.

Such then was Mary; brave, high-spirited, princely, full of talent and intellect, radiant with beauty and grace; blessed too with an even temper, a happy disposition, a freedom from petty weaknesses and foibles, and gifted with all companionable and social qualities—but heartless and unprincipled, and, as her whole life shows, living, acting, hoping, joying, grieving, plotting, sinning, for *self* alone.

- ART. III.—1. *The Law of Pews in Churches, &c.* By G. H. H. OLIPHANT, ESQ. *Barrister-at-law.* London: Longman & Co. 1850.
2. *Church Pews, their Origin and Legal Incidents, with some Observations on the Propriety of abolishing them.* By JOHN COKE FOWLER, ESQ. *Barrister-at-law.* London: Rivingtons. 1844.
3. *The Pew System the chief Hindrance of the Church's Work in Towns. A Sermon by the Rev. EDWARD STUART, M. A.* London: Masters. 1852.

IF much has been said and written upon any theoretical principles, be they good or bad, the advocates of those principles would do well to keep in view some external index, such as circumstances will never fail to give them, of the manner in which their influence is gaining ground. This external index is afforded, in Church matters, by the material buildings in which Churchpeople assemble together to exercise their common offices of religion, and by the arrangements which are then and there observed. Of architecture, as symbolizing the principles of the Church, in hewing out of earth's deep and awful caverns the glorious temples of the living God, as creating some foretaste of nature's own redemption; or of that inspired wisdom by which God's will may be done in earth, after some sort, as it is in Heaven, through means of a certain exquisite harmony and beauty in which nature cooperates with man in the praises and in the work of our common Maker; of Christian art, in short, we mean to speak but little: it is to the practical arrangements of plain men and women when occupied in public religious offices, that we would now call the attention of our readers. This is the substance, we must always bear in mind, which it is the province of art to adorn; nay, even, in the first instance, of bare walls to shelter and protect, if beauty cannot be consulted. Christians may worship and have worshipped under the open sky; the running stream was the font of early converts; the desert has been the scene of Christian eloquence in its turn, as have aisles and naves of sculptured stone; caves and holes of the earth have witnessed the highest mysteries of our religion, in common with that type of the heavenly Jerusalem which the Christian sanctuary may represent to our outward senses. It is not, then, of architecture, which shuts out the world and suspends a hallow-

ing canopy over the sacred work of God's service; it is not of painting and sculpture, that remind the assembly of God's people of the glory of heaven, and that teach them of Christian truths; it is not of music, that unites and refines and spiritualizes the expressions of assembled prayer and service; it is not of ascending incense, that betokens the oblations of our hearts' devotion, and the sweet perfume with which heaven envelops the performance of its own work; it is not of these adornments, which divers branches of the Church have more or less adopted as the accompaniments of Christian worship, but it is of the rude mass which preceded all these in point of time, and which now precedes them in importance,—it is of the assembly of people themselves that we would now speak, supposing them met together on free and open ground in the primitive and patriarchal simplicity of divine worship. There is a pleasure in the thought of personal freedom on which much of our peace of mind or power of concentrated attention must ever depend. The open air and common ground is the normal type and natural image of this freedom; and now that the joke of *Lydian worship* has had its sway, we must be excused for sympathising in some sort with its noble propounder, in using such a well-authorized figure to express his yearning after a mode of service that was free from certain things which he felt to be restrictions to his soul's free action. This our sympathy is also in common with a lower order of creation than the above-named object, for our own feeling in many churches, is to desire the fair and open banks of a river, resting on the smooth and verdant turf, as eagerly as the panting sheep immured in the pens of Smithfield. Our sympathy, indeed, is more closely connected with these latter objects, for it is not a desire that any of our brethren should, as it were, be shorn of their white garments; it is not our dread of surpliced priests, but it is our natural and personal dislike to be knocked about at the mercy of others, and to be shut up in pens or pews, without any choice on our part, unless we madly rush forth and forfeit the whole object in view; we like not to be stuck up, classed, and registered, according to our sleekness or our poverty, for two or three mortal hours. We do not mean that a certain restriction of personal liberty is to be avoided, for it necessarily occurs in any mutual arrangements between men and men: but our immediate object in suggesting this pastoral simile, is to realize the normal idea of a congregation with its pastor, before any artificial methods of order have been established, or even any conveniences have been developed. We wish to start afresh, as it were, and would be repelled by the evils and abuses of existing practices to the very origin and essential elements of Christian worship, alike free from the

proprieties of a higher state, and from the misuse of such laws and regulations as those proprieties required.

Let us picture then to ourselves, in the first place, an assembled congregation, without reference to any building whatever; no one can doubt that the ministrations of the Church would be valid, and, in Missionary labours, this is often witnessed as the real mode of operation till something else can be attained. From this commencement, then, we may trace what would obviously be the growth of such simple worship into a permanent institution. Conveniencies and adornments would naturally suggest themselves, but yet the original freedom would be witness of a principle which ought always to be retained. The Christian religion is essentially voluntary; 'Come unto Me' are the words of invitation, not of command, and the penalty of not coming is the loss of spiritual not of temporal advantages, except incidentally. The assembly, therefore, of Christians, is that of a voluntary coming to the representatives or ministers of Him who first used these words; it should be one of ready access and easy departure, unless by mutual understanding some private restraint is submitted to, for the public good. Individuals, then, would converge from their respective abodes to some centre where it was known that the teaching and the ministration, which they were willing to join, were to be going on. A crowd voluntarily met together on the common ground of intrinsic equality, feel this; though, if well-mannered, there will be deference shown towards individuals and classes. If this congregation listen to the teaching which they come to hear, they will learn gentleness and forbearance of temper, though individual responsibility and equality of interest will be found strongly urged. The natural laws, therefore, which regulate a crowd will be fixed, though private annoyances will be kept in check. They who have felt the spirit of that teaching, and learnt that some heavenly gift was held by commission in the hands of their instructors, will come again, and the congregation will then not be migratory or temporary, but that apostle of good tidings will be induced to remain, and his flock will gather round him habitually, acquiring thereby the bonds of a common family, from the rites which are administered as well as from the natural sympathy of being united in a common cause.

Another consideration, however, will now occur, which must draw our minds away from the idea of a mere crowd assembled to hear sermons or even to join in some acts of common prayer. The sacraments of the Church will obviously require a certain degree of reserve in their administration, which will prompt our imagined Missionary of the desert to desire a small covering or tabernacle wherein to minister the more sacred mysteries of his

religion, even though he still preached in the open air. Thus a chancel for himself and those immediately engaged in the direction of holy things will be the first building erected. The Bishop of New Zealand and his Missionaries celebrate the mysteries of the faith under a tent, the congregation being in the open air. The very nature of the offices thus performed will immediately suggest thus much of a covering, and this state of things would seem to correspond with the Apostolic era, when upper rooms were selected for the breaking of the bread, while other duties were performed as chance or opportunity enabled. Having now arrived at the stage of having a Sanctuary and Holy Place, the plain and the sky being still the floor and the roof of the nave, with trees to be the pillars and to form the aisles, it is obvious, in that natural settlement of ecclesiastical arrangements which we are depicting from its very elements, that the assembled people outside this chancel will also desire some protection from the heat or cold, the wind or rain, as the case may be. They will also desire a seclusion from others who have not joined their body, or who manifest in different degrees an hostility to their religion. As the habits of Christian devotion gain on them, they will also feel the benefit of retirement from the ordinary sights and sensations of the outer world. All these motives will prompt them to erect a covering over their assembly. Holding the assembly itself as the primary idea, we prefer saying, that they will erect a covering over themselves, to saying, they will make a building in which to assemble; for the natural disposition and order of the assembly, apart from the idea of any building whatever, is what we wish to refer to. Four plain walls, then, will be thrown up, with a roof of simplest construction, which will adjoin the before erected Sanctuary, the doors of which will probably be made of open work, that there may be direct communication between the two, though the place for general preaching will still be outside. According to one theory of the prevalence of pillars and arches in church architecture, these deviations from the simple walls we have described will be carrying out the resemblance to some avenue of trees, under whose shade the first meetings will have been held.

Supposing all this to have taken place on open and common ground, and also supposing that the law of the land subsequently not only sanctioned the whole proceeding, but identified itself with it, by considering it the act of the whole people of a certain district, and not only of a part, we have the entire system of a parish church at once before us as now recognised by law. The branch of the subject thus opened out to us, with which we are now concerned, has only to do with the disposition of the people

assembled in this church. The relations between the State and the management of the Church in other respects, we shall not touch upon, but confine ourselves to the question of that area, which the Church by the very title of nature considers to be common, open, and free; which freedom the law confirms and makes universal to all parish churches, as arising from the act of consecration, whatever the accidental origin of a church may have been in each place. All churches may have been founded by individuals on their own ground, but after the act of consecration, the law, in theory, considers it given to the Church, and exactly in the same position as the church we have pictured to have arisen on the wild desert, owned by none, the labour being performed as a common work.

The normal idea, therefore, of a church is, that of free and open ground for the use of the Christian community within each parish. All baptized Christians who have not been legally deprived of the rights thus belonging to them, as by excommunication, have a right to free admission, as all subjects have a right to walk on the highways. The law defines this right, even in exceptions of individual appropriation, to be of the nature of an easement; that is, not a property, but a right to use, or the privilege of a certain accommodation, as when one man may walk through another's ground, or may have a right of water not passing through his own land. Up to a certain point everything seems to establish this freedom and protect those members of the Christian community, who, owing to the accident of poverty, are not in a position to assert their rights, from being thrust aside. It is supposed that the church is every one's home, where he has a right to go, with ease and freedom, for Christian worship, subject only to such rules as must be established in any public institution for the common benefit of its members; nor, if this is really and truly the case with the inhabitants of the district or parish, will there be any fear lest strangers should be exposed to any unpleasant exclusion. They will share in the general freedom of the place within all reasonable limits, though, strictly speaking, the original open character of the church is a right of a local nature. The unity, however, of the Church, as composed of many local branches and interests, with the mutual interchange of rights and privileges naturally arising therefrom, is a distinct subject from what we need now consider. There is a certain claim, in justice and equity, which all have in churches of their own communion, though not parishioners, which is generally felt and acknowledged, and which it would be difficult to oppose in practice in such an open system as ought to be adopted towards parishioners, and which therefore we need not accurately define,

inasmuch as it is not the right which is principally endangered, or which is most important.

Certain rules we have acknowledged to be essential in the management of this assembly, even to make the best of this free and public right of all parishioners to the use of the church; and here it is that we come to the more intricate difficulties of the pew system. The law provides for these rules in an admirable manner according to its theory, but the precedents of years have so overloaded the original idea, that in too many places there exists the greatest difficulty in asserting it. The freehold of the church is placed in the Clergy, subject to certain laws by which to exercise the privileges of freehold. The church must be open during times of service, and generally for the rites of the Church. The parish priest on his part is also under compulsion to perform those rites. The church therefore is necessarily open. The same authority under which the parochial clergy hold their rights, viz. that of the Ordinary or Bishop, also appoints two officers, called churchwardens, to manage the placing in due order those who come into the building in accordance with their popular rights. They have to see that those who enter come for certain religious purposes, and if they misconduct themselves, they are making a use of the place to which their claim does not entitle them. They may therefore be ejected, just as a man who enters a field to walk on a public path is no longer in a secure position if he begins to dig up the soil; his right in the place is particular, not general. Public freedom, therefore, is no way interfered with by the power of the churchwardens, as long as people are properly engaged.

But now, having reached the point of finding our Church machinery admirably calculated in theory to preserve the elementary freedom which pertains to Christian worship, let us look, before we enter further into detail, at the state of things which, in process of time, grew out of this apparently well-balanced adjustment, and which even now is painfully visible in too many of our churches.

The office of Churchwardens, as representing the Ordinary, was to arrange people as they came into church, according to those principles which natural good taste, acting on the mass, would dictate, so that individuals would have to give up ill-regulated fancies to the general notions of propriety which prevailed over the congregation. The churchwardens, in fact, represented the good sense and experience of the whole, rather than enforced any arbitrary power, for we always bear in mind, that the Church never invites her flock in order to tyrannize over them. Now, good feeling in the mass will ever give a voluntary deference to position and station, and the courtesies

of life are not only encouraged, but highly developed by the whole theory of the Church, and that consistently with an equal development of the doctrine of Christian equality. This voluntary deference was entrusted for its execution to the officers of the Church, who were charged to place men according to their station. So far all is natural and fair, for it is to be presumed that these officers were not only to respect rank and station, but generally were to represent courtesy and good manners; and that, therefore, women, the aged, and infirm, such as the deaf, would be marked out as objects of peculiar consideration. No theory, however, will work without the guidance of a living principle within the sphere of its supposed operation. You may balance a thing as nicely as you like, but there must be some solid foundation, or some innate spirit of buoyancy always kept up, or the balance will be lost. In proportion, therefore, as the Church lost some portion of her true Catholic theory, or lost spiritual vitality, so, in the order of things, may we expect that the well-balanced system of Church arrangements would incline to one side or other, influenced by some worldly attraction, or disturbed by some hostile force. In other words, we may always expect that selfishness and avarice will supplant courtesy and openness of heart, if not suppressed by a constant struggle. The outward system of the Church does not pretend to have a mystical power of going on quietly and orderly, without a corresponding vitality of spirit; it is rather the fruit and token of that vitality; as we have presumed in ascribing the origin of ecclesiastical arrangements to the working of natural principle; common sense and courtesy taking as their premises the truths of revelation, conscious also of the continual guidance of the Spirit consecrating all such means. This injunction, therefore, to the officers of the Church, to place people according to their station, harmless in its first intention, and consistent with the original freedom of Christian worship, though still touching on very tender ground, became a great power for evil, when popular ideas of the use of a Church were somewhat altered, and deadness prevailed over too many of her offices.

The history of church-sittings is thus briefly summed up by Mr. Oliphant:—

‘In our cathedrals, and other ancient ecclesiastical edifices, there seems to have been an entire absence of any fixed and regularly constructed accommodation for the laity, as an essential part of the building. For, before the Reformation, no seats were allowed, nor any distinct apartment in the church assigned to distinct inhabitants, except for some very great persons.

‘The first seats permitted to be used were moveable forms, for the ease of the parishioners, to sit during those parts of the service, for which kneeling or standing were not directed by the ritual of the times. These

moveable seats were the property of the Incumbent, and in all respects at his disposal; and they were frequently bequeathed by incumbents to their successors, or others, as they thought fit. The Common Law books of an early period mention but two or three cases upon this subject, and those relating to the chancels and seats of persons of great quality.

'In later times, however, pews have been usually provided, as conducing to more undivided attention, and affording a point of union and mutual good example among individuals of families, so that they are probably an assistance to the devotions of the occupiers.'—*Law of Pews*, pp. 2, 3.

Archæologists would remind this writer of the stone bench surrounding the whole church, which is of so frequent occurrence in our old churches; and he has certainly transgressed somewhat the strict limits of his profession, when he ventured on an opinion as to the devotional, or social, effect of pews. That pews were not esteemed an unmixed good even on their first introduction, we have the witness of Dr. Corbett, Bishop of Norwich, who in 1622 thus writes to his clergy:—

"Stately pews are now become tabernacles with rings and curtains to them. There wants nothing but beds to hear the word of God on: we have casements, locks, and keys, and cushions, and for those we love the church. I will not guess what is done within them: who sits, stands, or lies asleep at prayers, communion, &c.; but this I dare say, they are either to hide some vice, or to proclaim one; to hide disorder, or to proclaim pride." So in the orders and directions of Bishop Wren, issued in the Diocese of Norwich in 1636, it is directed "that no pews be made over high, so that they which be in them cannot be seen how they behave themselves, or the prospect of the church or chancel be hindered; and therefore that all pews which do much exceed a yard in height, be taken down near to that scantling."

The above passage we extract from Mr. Fowler's very able and interesting little treatise on our present subject of pews. In tracing the growth of pews, he first considers the origin of that word. Dr. Johnson defines it, 'an enclosed seat in a church,' and its probable derivation is from the Dutch word 'puye,' signifying an enclosed balcony from which to speak, from the Latin *podium*, a place next the orchestra, where great people sat. It was used for the place where the service was read, and also for that enclosure which the lords of the manor were the first to erect in church for their accommodation. The general idea connected with the derivation of the word is, that of an enclosure of rather a conspicuous character, as Milton talks of sheep in their 'pues' in Smithfield, meaning the pens where they were exposed for sale. The able paper published by the Cambridge Camden Society some years ago, and to which mainly is to be attributed the distaste into which 'pues' have fallen, it is scarcely necessary to recall to our readers. The following is a comprehensive and interesting account of the supposed history of pews, from Mr. Fowler—

‘Persons who have visited Roman Catholic countries, can easily imagine that this would be the case so long as England formed part of the Romish communion. For whatever may be the errors and corruptions of that Church, respect of persons within the walls of her sacred buildings, and indulgence of personal ease and accommodation there, are certainly not to be laid to her charge. The services of that Church indeed make accommodation for *sitting* of much less consequence to her members than to ourselves. Chaunting and prayer, with short selections from the Scripture, form the chief features of those services; and accordingly Roman Catholic congregations will be generally observed to be either standing or kneeling. Nor was the practice of preaching lengthy sermons, or rather (as it should now be called) of reading long essays, so much in vogue as it was afterwards under the reign of the Puritans, who carried it to a ludicrous extent, or as it is at present in a more moderate degree amongst ourselves. Under these circumstances, therefore, we should not expect to find general and luxurious accommodation for *sitting* in the early English churches, even if there were nothing but mere conjecture to rely upon.

‘The most probable account is, that the exclusive appropriation of seats was *gradually* brought into fashion. The origin of English parish-churches was, speaking generally, the erection of an edifice by the feudal lord of a manor on his own property, for the benefit of his own family and his tenants, and the subsequent annexation of the tithes of that district to the church which he had built. Many founders of churches would probably reserve some part of the floor for the use of themselves, their families, and their successors; or if not, yet in the time which elapsed between the foundation of most of our churches and the Reformation, it was natural that the same pride and exclusive feelings which have served to perpetuate pews, should have suggested to their successors, sooner or later, to obtain for themselves a grant or licence of appropriation of some distinct portion of the church. Many years might again elapse before any one would presume to solicit a similar distinction. But in proportion as the awe of feudal dignity faded away, and growing commerce swelled the wealth and importance of other classes, and the property of ancient families began to be transferred to other hands, so the acquisition of Church privileges was extended, and other influential families were allowed occasionally to appropriate new portions of the floor. So that about the period of the Reformation, a parish-church would probably have presented the appearance of a floor partially covered with moveable seats, open benches, chairs or stools, with here and there one or more detached pews appropriated to the principal parishioners. Then the Reformation, with its lengthened services, and sermons, rendered accommodation for sitting of much more importance than before, and pews became rather more common than before: by-and-by the old open seats and chairs required reparation or renewal; and when a general new seating was determined upon, the privileges of the pew were imitated throughout, and the old fashion of moveable or open seats almost entirely discarded.’—*Church Pews*, pp. 7—10.

The progress of this evil is easy enough to imagine. Selfishness and pride made the possession of a church pew a matter of personal dignity. The authorities of the Church sanctioned this by the odious system of faculties, and where these were not granted, the law, which judges by precedent rather than by abstract right, supposed that long use implied a faculty, and called this a prescriptive right. Sales and bartering then followed; the original freedom and equality of a church was

altogether lost; the poor were left to feel their poverty more acutely in church than anywhere else; in town congregations the rich possessed the whole space of the church, and the poor got quite out of the habit of looking on the church as their own; those who went found themselves in back parts, and seated in places which marked their low estate very strikingly. They were unable to enjoy any sense of freedom, and could not choose any position according to their necessities or infirmities. They were put to a very unfair test in the matter of going to church, as compared with the rich. To the latter it was a positive sign and mark of rank, an opportunity of display, a gratification to their pride, while to the former it was quite the reverse. It is not, therefore, just to compare the habits of different classes of people in any matter which holds out these varied inducements; which attracts the one even on selfish principles, but requires a great exercise of humility in the other. To prove the operation of this state of things, we may refer to the habits of the poor in country places, where there are no gentry or influential tradesmen, except the squire and one or two farmers, to have absorbed the whole church to themselves. We there find the labourers generally very regular in attending church; whereas in towns the influence of the middle classes seems quite to have driven the poor away, and to have stamped the church with the ignoble title of the rich man's religion.

This state of things—for it is unnecessary further to describe what all so well know, and what is now an oft-told tale—is entirely, after the common principle of a gradual spoliation, sanctioned by law, according to the received necessity of making abstract right yield to the habits of a people and to a series of precedents. An original right is always supposed to lapse if possession has been held by other parties for a certain length of time. We do not say that this principle is unjust, for it is a necessary law of society, and it is futile to suppose that rights will continue in force, with no claimants, from generation to generation. Nor was that pure and spiritual duty of the Church, to protect the privileges of the poor, likely to be undertaken by the secular arm when forgotten by the Church herself. The Church must either do her work or lose her ground. If, for example, the Church makes no proper use of her revenues, of course, as by nature they are *ipso facto* made secular, so will the law in time establish that fact, and the Church will find herself spoiled of her inheritance outwardly as inwardly she had long been so.

In the case of churches this spoliation has gone to very great lengths, and the matter has been made more difficult to manage,

by modern legislation adopting quite a different theory in the establishment and building of new churches to that which we have pictured in tracing the inherent freedom of our old parish churches. Modern habits and abuses were legalized by being made to form the basis of a new system in district churches and chapels. Still, however, the distinction between the two was always recognised, and the freedom of a parish church has seldom been altogether swamped, so strongly is the principle fixed in the whole legal position of the Church. A parish Church, in which all the pews are rented, is rare. It was indeed a matter of necessity to make district churches dependent on rents, and thus to destroy their free character; not because it was an approved system, but because no one came forward with that self-sacrifice which is always a necessary element of more perfect systems. It is obvious, therefore, that unless we have the spirit of self-sacrifice which is necessary to form endowments, and to give the church, clergy and all, as it were, to the benefit of the cause of Christ, we must be content to pass over the evil of our pew-renting district churches. They may do good in their way, but they are not true churches according to the original type; they are only private associations to relieve the parish church by hiring an ecclesiastic to perform the public acts of religion to a select company, the proceeding being cleared of the charge of schism by special provisions and licences.

With all the difficulties and obstructions that cloud the pure free ideal of a Christian Church, that primeval element has yet, providentially, escaped far more than might have been feared. The fearful unchristian effects of the pew system have at all times stood in such bold contrast to the Gospel blessings on the poor, that advocates have never been wanting to maintain the true principle; and now that the Church is striving to be active in her work, it is marvellous to witness how abuses, which had hitherto been so long established as to form legal precedents, seem to crumble into dust before the obvious and clear light of justice and Christian truth. Yet this is but partial, and the freedom of Christian worship is sadly overlooked in many quarters where we might have hoped that this development of their other professed principles would have forced itself upon their notice.

The prejudices in favour of pews are not overcome, and architects now have to contend with the same feelings which obstructed Sir Christopher Wren, of whom it is said, that 'he considered 'it to be desirable that there should be no pews in churches, but 'only benches, and complained that there was no stemming the 'tide of profit and the advantage of the pew-openers.' No part of the Church movement that has been going on for the last twenty years has been so prolific of visible results as the improvement

in the arrangement of church sittings; and so far we ought to be thankful for this witness to the Christian truth we are now advocating, for we call it nothing less: yet there are many discouraging signs in some of the restorations even now in progress; and we fear there is still a great affection for pews and pew doors, though actual traffic in the church, we hope, has received its death-blow. In many churches lately restored, we have the architectural beauty of a better system; but the door is still allowed, not only to remain, but to be rebuilt, thus keeping up the great mark of the exclusive system, though slightly glossed over by being a little lower and having pretty carving upon it.

Nothing, to our minds, is so disappointing as to see this adoption of revived architecture, without the ideas that ought to go along with it. The only thought that can reconcile one to it is, that to a certain extent the Church is prepared for better things in future. It is singular to observe in how many new or restored churches everything is nice but some one or two points, which, to a correct eye, spoil the whole. This is often connected with the altar; but into this question we shall not enter. The reading-desk is another tender point on which depends much of the character which outward arrangements are able to stamp on the service. There is a new church in the parish of Hackney, really quite a model in most respects. It is nobly situated, the spire is very handsome, the interior very solemn, and the seats open; but in the midst of the church stands, elaborately carved, the offensive structure of pulpit, reading-desk, and clerk's desk; in fact, a regular old three-decker, in full sail westward.¹ This same part-revival of better things is often very apparent in what immediately comes under our present notice. Poppy-heads, with lions, dogs, griffins, with a vast number of mediæval devices, may be seen standing erect in solid oak; the whole area of the church, perhaps, may seem to bristle with luxuriant freedom, as symbolized by art; but yet, on further examination, all this is mere sham: there are nothing but exclusive old pews, after all, though not quite so high. It is really too bad to see the pretty details of architecture actually made use of for purposes so contrary to their true ideal as pew hinges and latches. Solid oak doors, with clumsy bolts and hinges, are very noisy concerns; and if doors are determined on, let them be simple,

¹ That this abomination has been introduced by a new Incumbent, and that it was entirely contrary to the known wishes and intentions of one who spent so much upon this church, the late Rector, Mr. Norris, it is only fair to state. But the crying evil is, that whatever ritual propriety, and at whatever cost, has been as it seems, secured to a church, authority is always ready to spoil and ruin the magnificent and pious labours of the departed at the first summons of a conceited ignorant successor.

light contrivances, with modern spring latches, made in such a manner as to show that they do not altogether harmonize with the rest, but are of a temporary nature. Far better, however, is it to have no doors at all; and in that respect, as well as in all others, let architecture be made expressive of its congenial ideas, and not be introduced as an unmeaning appendage to something quite different from its natural character.

We have implied that there seems to have been a slight pause in the pew agitation during the last few years. It is perhaps well that there should have been time to see how a practical subject of such a nature operates of its own force, unfostered by any unnatural agitation. At the first start of the Church movement, there was a justice so obvious in this department of its work, that many took it up kindly without reference to any other principle connected with it. It stood on its own merits, and produced an amazing change in more churches than is generally imagined, especially in rural districts. Since that, however, it has shared the odium of many other popular cries, and has been forced into doing so for selfish purposes. The cry of popery is a very convenient method of exciting a prejudice against anything whatever to which an individual has had a previous antipathy as being contrary to his own interests.

Having now considered the present state of the pew question as an historical subject up to within the last few years, we are anxious, in the next place, to draw attention to the actual working of open seats where they have been adopted. In doing this we have had recourse to the experience of several persons who have kindly aided us according to their several opportunities. The time required for collecting any great mass of evidence, together with the fact that an anonymous writer in a review has no claim to expect much trouble in his behalf, or much confidence from influential persons, must be our apology for not having a great show of statistics to offer. Many with whom we have corresponded have kindly volunteered to send their experience, but, from the press of other matters, and the difficulty perhaps which some feel in compressing a large and rather indefinite subject, we have not yet received their communications. We are, however, unwilling to defer the subject, and with our best thanks for the kind intentions of those for whom we are unable to wait, with apologies also for not so doing, we shall turn at once to those communications which have been so promptly forwarded. For these we express our sincerest gratitude to the writers, trusting that the use we are about to make of them will be in accordance with their wishes. We shall introduce no names, except, occasionally, those of places where the information afforded is free and open to all.

The plan we have adopted has been to forward a list of heads comprising such advantages as might be expected to result from open seats, in order to elicit confirmatory remarks or otherwise. It is fair to state that we have received answers of an unfavourable nature as well as the reverse; but where this has occurred, we have only been thereby reminded that the pew question does not stand alone, but that it is involved in many other kindred reforms without which the freedom of churches cannot effectually operate, as for instance, where it is complained that open seats do not bring in money so readily as pews. This we do not dispute, but as it is only the particular question of seats we have now to examine, we must concede, as indeed we have before done, that where there are no endowments and a clergyman is unable to run great risks, the necessity of the case must swamp the benefit we now advocate. Again, where open churches fail to attract the poor, we must not at once come to the conclusion that they are an unimportant element in the reformation of religious habits in those classes; for the services of the Church also require more adaptation to their powers and convenience than is generally the case before we can hope that they will be attracted, especially if we bear in mind the strength of habit, and the entire absence for many generations of any true popular feeling in large towns of the holiness of consecrated places.

We propose in the first place to lay before our readers each head, under which we endeavoured to elicit the advantages of open seats, with such direct testimony as we have already obtained to that particular proposition, reserving more general and unclassified remarks to follow after.

Our first proposition was as follows:—

‘That open seats, even if appropriated, are more easily apportioned to the actual and varying wants of each household, and occasion less waste of room than is found by experience to be the case in the old pew system; and even where room is no object, enable the congregation to be more closely gathered together in the best parts of the church.’

The lay author of a very widely circulated and interesting little work, on the subject generally of reverence due to holy places, to whose courtesy we are greatly indebted, having paid much practical attention to church seats, both before writing that work, which was some years ago, and also since, now says,

‘My views as to the appropriation of seats, since that work was written, are somewhat changed. From experience, I doubt whether *any* appropriation, however restricted, is desirable, or at all needful.’

The active and laborious clergyman of a large sea-port district, where a handsome new church has lately been built, thus gives his experience:—

'The seats in my church are *all free*, though by common consent persons who are in the habit of attending regularly find their way without molestation to their favourite sittings. Not only is room saved by this arrangement, but gas and trouble in cleaning, no unimportant items in churches where service is celebrated daily, as here. On ordinary week-day evenings we only light six burners, and on festivals, when there is a sermon, eight, and those in the best part of the church, so that the congregation is more closely gathered together. I have never found any difficulty in the way of the congregation seating themselves from the seats being open.'

To vary the scene we now turn to the testimony of a rector in a small rural parish of Wiltshire, in which the church has within the last few years been rebuilt with very great care as to all internal fittings. He thus writes in answer to our first proposition:—

'I see the truth of this every Sunday. Three seats in my church (for special reasons) have doors—low doors, it is true, but still doors. They are appropriated to three distinct families. One is constructed to hold seven persons, the others four each. In a morning, the average attendance in the three seats is five; in the afternoon, two. But though they are only allotted seats, held neither by faculty nor prescription, and the vacancies might therefore legally be occupied by other parties in case of stress of room, the *doors* appear to form an insuperable obstacle; and I see people crowded in other parts of the church, five into seats only constructed for four, while there is room to spare here. We have three other allotted seats without doors, which are not liable to this abuse to anything *like the same extent*; though certainly, the fact that they are allotted, is not without its deterring influence even here.'

The Incumbent of a country town, with a noble church lately restored from the worst abuses of the old system, under this head says:—

'There is certainly less waste of room with open seats than in the old square pew system; and there is a greater disposition, I think, to be accommodating to strangers.'

From the Clergyman of a new church in the suburb of a cathedral city, we thus hear:—

'There can be no doubt of the saving of room effected by the adoption of open seats; the poor, instead of being huddled into galleries, in the side aisles, and under the organ, may be thus placed in a favourable position to hear and see.'

A Clergyman of great influence, both from his position in the Church and in society, a most judicious observer of all that passes around him, and who has three churches in his parish, thus confirms this first proposition:—

'There can be no doubt that open seats, if appropriated, occasion less waste of room, and enable the congregation to gather together more closely. The advantage of this is great on week-days and Saints'-days.'

We heard, personally, from the Vicar of a country town, that he had found the truth of this by most vivid contrast in his church between the state of things before a late restoration and

since. He managed with some difficulty to avoid having doors erected, and finally prevailed, on the ground of saving money which might be devoted to a new heating apparatus. All are now well satisfied, the body of the church is fairly and evenly filled, though, from the strictness of the appropriating system, and the great number of the middle classes in the place, the poor were not benefited as he could have wished.

We add to the present division of our subject by the testimony of a layman, whose knowledge of different parts of the country, as a tourist and otherwise, and whose interest in the subject, together with a lively manner of narration, will doubtless make his communication very acceptable to our readers, especially when they bear in mind that the coming extract is but one of several which will be introduced under their proper headings:—

‘ So far as I have had experience of churches containing open seats, I can bear explicit testimony to the truth of this first proposition,—so far as regards open seats generally,—for I do not know many instances in which the open seats are appropriated; but these few are in no respects exceptions to the general rule. Weybridge, Surrey, is one of these. In the old church, where there were the old high pews, the congregation in the week were scattered here and there over the church, each one in his own pew; in the new church,—built where the old one, a wretched structure, was pulled down,—the seats are appropriated, but open, and the congregation now are “closely packed together in the best parts of the church.” By means of the open seats, two great family pews were got rid of, one always empty, belonging to an extinct family; the second almost always empty, and never nearly full. Thus a great saving of room was effected, as no seats answering to these are found in the new church. The same remarks will apply to Thorpe Church in Surrey, where a pew that would hold sixteen was tenanted by one lady only, whose servants on one occasion actually left the church, not being able to find room elsewhere. In the same church there was a single pew which filled up nearly the whole of the south transept: when the church was arranged with open seats, this was removed, and four or five seats substituted, holding on the whole about twenty persons. In this church, also, the open seats were appropriated. In S. Mary’s church, Kidderminster, there are a few appropriated open seats, which are found far preferable to the old pews, and many unappropriated. The practical advantage of these over the high pews, as collecting the congregation together, is clearly manifested in this church; for whenever any persons in possession of pews happen to attend the daily service, they resort to their pews in all parts of the church, whereas the rest of the congregation are gathered into one place. This will, probably, not be applicable to future times, as all of the pews remaining in the church are at this time either actually removed, or immediately to be so. In the mother church of a parish in Wiltshire there is a “private aisle” blocked up by a very large pew thrown across the arch, which fills up nearly half of the aisle, and makes the rest of it utterly inaccessible. This pew, when it is not kept locked, is sometimes occupied by the page belonging to a lady’s household in the parish, who was placed there originally for the purpose of keeping out another family who wanted to use it. The whole aisle is therefore useless. Another large pew is empty regularly for half the year. This one would hold about twelve or fourteen persons. Although

on account of the prevalence of dissent in this parish, the church is unfortunately by no means straitened in room, the fact of the *waste* is equally undeniable. A few appropriated, and a good number of unappropriated open seats exist, and the effect of these is similar to that which I have mentioned with respect to Kidderminster. At Shepperton, in Middlesex, before the removal of the great pews, which was about seven years ago, evils of a similar nature abounded. The church is but small, certainly not larger than the parish requires, (especially as Shepperton is one of those few places in which there is not one dissenter;) indeed, the Rector would be glad to enlarge it if he could, and yet under the old system, fully one-third of the length on one side was swallowed up by two pews of unusual magnitude. In the larger of these two only two persons generally sat; occasionally there were others, but it was seldom or never anything like full. There were other pews which occupied far more of the church than was justified by the size of the households of the occupiers. Now these evils are removed, and the new seats, though to a considerable extent appropriated, from the circumstance of having low small doors, not in strictness *open* seats, are not the cause of any waste of room, or at the worst of very little.

‘With respect to the extent of saving in room attained by the substitution of open seats for old pews, I cannot speak decidedly, not having examined a sufficient number of instances; but leaving out of the question those which are generally seated in an omnibus fashion, *i. e.* on both the long sides, and at least one of the short ones, I should think that the gain would be fully equal to one in six, probably rather more than less, taking the average width of both pews and open seats. Of course, in reseating any ordinary church, the proportion of gain over the whole area would probably be considerably more than this, as there would almost certainly be some one or more pews of more imposing dimensions than I have allowed for; one in five would be more near the mark.’

One case mentioned in this communication would seem not legitimately to further our argument, inasmuch as there are doors; we have not, however, excluded it, as in the contrast between the old and the new system, the present advantages are obviously derived from what is an approach to open pews, though we should have preferred seeing that principle literally and boldly developed.

Our second proposition was as follows:—

‘2d.—That open seats, not appropriated by definite authority, do ultimately admit of a parochial congregation, quietly and orderly arranging themselves for service, without any serious inconvenience or evil results.’

Under this head our correspondents all say much the same thing, agreeing that there is no trouble in the arrangement of a congregation in perfectly open seats. Indeed, if any one fairly inquires whether the open or enclosed part of any particular church, he may be acquainted with, has been the cause of most trouble and ill feeling in the arrangement of a congregation, there is, we think, no doubt that the enclosed part will be found most guilty of misdemeanors. One whom we have before quoted, says: ‘In the free seats, I find the people almost always occupying the same place without confusion, and, as far as I

'know, without dispute; though of course an irregular church-goer will come in and occupy a seat which is generally in the tenancy of his more regular neighbour, and a momentary dissatisfaction may have been created at his having to turn out. But I have never known the dissatisfaction more than momentary.' Another says: 'I find by a short experience in a new church and congregation, that they gradually, by common assent, set apart certain seats to themselves. I encourage this appropriation by regular attendants among the poor: there is no disorder at all in the matter.' Again: 'We find the portion of our open seats which is not appropriated, filled in a quiet and orderly manner; and that, too, long before the service commences.' One before referred to says: 'I built a church nine years ago, in which all the seats are open and free, and I have never known any one deprived of the seat he usually occupies, nor have I seen any inconvenience to result from it. The congregation arrange themselves very quietly, and there is far more courtesy manifested.'

In a church built about eight years since in a sea-port town, as far almost from the town before mentioned of that description, as east and west in our island can make it possible, there are open benches throughout calculated for more than a thousand; two hundred of these are appropriated, but the remainder are perfectly free. The clergyman emphatically assured us that he could testify most strongly to the truth of our present heading, judging from his constant observation. Our more general correspondent writes thus:—

'I have seen many manifest proofs of the truth of this proposition, but never met with any single instance which could legitimately be urged in contradiction to it. The congregation assemble and arrange themselves quietly and orderly; and in many cases those who are regular in their attendance always occupy one unchanging place, which seems to be assigned them by general assent of their neighbours, and left vacant for them as a matter of course by those who may come in earlier. It may be well to add to this statement, that I never met with any one who so far imagined that he had any right to such a seat, as to attempt to remove from it any one who might happen to have occupied it before his arrival; I am aware that such cases exist, but I speak of my own experience; the whole arrangement, so far as it was found to exist, being apparently produced simply by the courtesy and common sense of the congregation, who were aware that it would tend in its measure to produce order and quiet in the church. This perhaps would be practicable only in small parishes, or at least in places where the congregation was composed of nearly the same individuals from day to day; hence it arises that I have observed it more in the congregations attending daily prayer, than in the Sunday congregation, although the persons whom I have alluded to frequently retain the same seat on the Sunday that they do in the week. Kidderminster and — are two cases very much in point, particularly the former, where the congregation being much larger than in the latter place, the practicability and convenience of this scheme of arrangement is more clearly set forth. The daily morning prayer was

usually attended while I was there, (*i.e.* for periods of three or four months at a time over a space of seven years,) by 70 or 100 persons, which is pretty well as times go; the evening prayer by about the same number, in the winter frequently by as many as 150 or from that to 200. Of the average congregation I should think 30 or 40 had their regular places; perhaps scarcely so many, but still a considerable proportion, and this certainly promoted the quiet and order of the church. Christ Church, Birmingham, is a good example of this second proposition; the body of this church is filled with open unappropriated seats; I believe the sides have pews, but I am not quite certain; (there are no *aisles*, as it is a modern Grecian affair, with no division between body and aisles except what the shafts supporting the galleries afford; and, though this has nothing to do with our immediate object further than to show this need not be looked on as a "party question"—it is the only church with which I am acquainted that is destitute of a font;) but certainly the congregation assemble themselves in a most regular and orderly manner, without any inconvenience at all. But to give full testimony to the truth of this proposition would be little else than to enumerate those churches which either in whole or in part contain open free seats, those being excepted where there are a few only, and they either thrust away under galleries, or hidden by large pews standing in front of them; I should be afraid to speak so much for these.'

Such then is found by experience to be the general benefit of open seats as regards the economy of room and the facility of arranging a congregation. To expect that free seats will draw large congregations, irrespective of other considerations, is of course unreasonable, in proof of which we may refer to that vast district of London called Bethnal Green. The new churches built there are, as far as sittings go, well constructed, though with some grievous faults of ecclesiastical propriety, not only in this respect, but in more important arrangements. It is a mysterious problem for the curious in social manners to solve, what becomes of the closely packed inhabitants of streets after streets in this part of London on their only day of rest. Persons best acquainted with their habits describe them as not badly off, for they are rather the better class of workmen; as being quiet and orderly so far as any political sentiments are involved in demonstrations of discontent; as not violently immoral or drunken, but as utterly regardless of any religious responsibility. The whole district is very uniform in character, consisting of streets, most of them recently and neatly built for the use of mechanics, with scarcely a house in the whole district adapted for the income of one hundred a-year. This kind of population on the Sunday, when all are released from their toil, might be pictured perhaps as turning out of their houses and filling the streets with noise and clamour expressive of unrestrained efforts after amusement; but these streets are perfectly quiet, as if most of the inhabitants were flown. The man indeed is seen, house after house, sitting in his shirt-sleeves reading the *Dispatch*; but that employment cannot

account for the general dearth of visible and youthful merriment. Where they all are we know not : some go to Victoria Park, but not in such numbers as to imply that it is a general resort ; some extend their walks further, and some occupy the public houses with their gardens and different enticements to pass away the time. One thing, however, is certain, that lamentably few of the real working class are to be found in the churches provided for them ; nor can dissent boast of any better success. It is not within our present subject to discuss any want of power which hampers the Church, as presented before these people for their religious edification ; but there is a great lack of that unity or corporate character, that central strength, which should always be preserved as a type of the Church's very existence. If churches here and there are scattered about, void of any plain and obvious unity by which all are seen to be instruments of a great central idea, that idea not only being an abstract vision, but a visible and earthly system as much as the single church or clergyman immediately before them ; if each church is left as it were in isolation, to take its chance among multitudes who have no conception of any particular claim on the part of the Church Catholic to their allegiance ; it must be expected that they will share the fate of all other unprotected institutions ; that disunion or even rivalry—witness the unhappy bickerings and under-selling in marriages among the clergy of this parish, which recently caused so much scandal—will spring up, and that, with the additional hindrance of great poverty in the external appointments of the churches, there will be a general want of dignity or greatness to command attention. If a clergyman is not seen to be acting as part of a living system, backed up in all he does by the whole momentum of that system, he is thrown back unfairly on his own individual powers of gaining popularity, and this, in the case before us, with very small means at his command.

But it may be said that the parochial system is the same there as elsewhere ; that the Bishop of the diocese is as much the centre of the Church in Bethnal Green as in rural districts ; yet this very mode of stating the case shows a nakedness in the Church's co-operation, as exhibited before an almost unchristian population. In rural districts it is not practically on the mere abstract existence of a Bishop that the poor and uneducated depend for the unity which is attached to the churches of each parish. The Church has a consolidated character from many associations and habits that come into their daily life. In Bethnal Green, however, the local antecedents have been very different. It is but a few years ago that the Church had no voice at all, as it were, in the manners of the people, from an

absolute dearth of churches or clergy. Thousands and thousands of men, women, and children, lived in small low houses, built back to back, with little plots of garden before each, in which bull-dogs or other animals, according to taste, were kept for Sunday recreation; the unfortunate cattle on this road to Smithfield being the hebdomadal objects of sport. A clergyman has informed us that, in his recollection as a boy, the streets of the whole district were given up to the amusement of bullock-baiting; that a wretched animal was separated from his fellows and chased from the helpless drovers as a sort of black-mail toll for the security of the rest. The recollection of our informant is much quickened as to the reality of this picture by himself having once been in very perilous proximity to the horns of an infuriated ox. Now, in planting Churches through a place like this, more demonstration of the Church's unity is required than the mere knowledge of episcopal superintendence over them all; this alone will not place the true character of the Church before the minds of the people. In early times all efforts at making a people Christian emanated from a central establishment, which in time became the full-blown cathedral or great church of the diocese; and no one can properly estimate the advantage which those very buildings have been of to our Church, in keeping up the central idea of unity through ages of indifference; the fact of S. Paul's Cathedral standing big and high in the centre of London, as a mother protecting her brood of smaller churches, has been a standing witness to the Church's consolidated character, which has taught an extensive lesson by a certain momentum, that derives its force from former times, and keeps it in spite of further impetus being almost stopped.

It is not for us to devise how this precedent might have been carried out in the case before us, but the lack of some solid foundation is a great hindrance to the Church in gaining influence over a fresh population; without this a church does not come before them with much greater appearance of authority than a dissenting meeting-house, and if that is the case it follows that the balance of attraction is to the latter, for it has more power of adaptation to popular taste, be that good or bad.

This digression from our immediate subject is admissible in order that our readers may comprehend a certain difference which we conceive to exist, in the general position of the Church through this district and elsewhere. The question, therefore, of open seats is not fairly tested by reference to such a field of operation; yet many of the advantages already enumerated cannot fail to be manifested, though large congregations are not thereby attracted. We have visited nearly all of the new churches, and can speak from observation that during the after-

noon services on Sunday the congregations are almost nominal; indeed, that it is only a matter of courtesy to use that expression to the few there assembled. In the evening they are larger, but in some cases they do not number more than a hundred even then. Few exceed two hundred, which is a small proportion of 7,000 supposed to be under the parochial care of each church. Those, however, who are present, seem well placed, and have the appearance of arranging themselves naturally and easily in the most convenient portions of the church, which avoids that aggravation of a small number afforded by a scattering into remote corners even of those few.

Under this branch of our subject we will introduce some useful examples of masses of people meeting together in an orderly manner, furnished by a layman resident in London:—

‘That large bodies of people can assemble and occupy seats not appropriated to them without any confusion or disorder is found at the sermons known as the “May Sermons,” when crowded congregations assemble as well in churches as in meeting-houses, and occupy the pews without regard to their ordinary appropriation.

‘The large meeting at Exeter Hall and similar places, where a few seats only are reserved, and the rest are open to all comers, are instances of the same thing.

‘There is a large chapel—the “City Road Chapel”—a central place of the Wesleyan Methodists; it is capable of holding, it is said, two thousand persons. Adjoining to it, and having an entrance from it, is a place called the “Morning Chapel,” capable of holding perhaps some hundreds. It is very common after the principal preaching in the larger chapel to hold another meeting in the smaller one, which is on such occasions crowded by persons who have been present in the large one, but even this passage from the large place, where each has his own rented seat, to the small one, where each takes the first seat which pleases him, is effected without confusion.

‘Of course, the ordinary assembling of a parochial congregation would be far less liable to confusion than any of the bodies above referred to.’

An instance of a similar kind has long been afforded in Ely Cathedral, where two congregations, one from the cathedral itself, and another from a neighbouring church, were regularly in the habit of assembling in the nave for the same sermon. Forms were arranged, and, of course without the smallest attempt at appropriation, which would have been impossible if desirable, all placed themselves with most perfect facility and mutual convenience. We do not know whether this practice continues, but it is a very good example, which we should like to see followed by all cathedrals, as far as preaching in the nave is concerned, apart from the whole Church Service in the same place.

We will now, however, proceed with the digest of our correspondence, under the head of dividing the sexes, as a help to the orderly arrangement of open seats. This is not a common practice, and therefore many who have written on other parts of

the subject are unable on this to give more than their views or their partial attempts, unsupported by any great experience.

One country correspondent says,—

‘This is an arrangement I have carried out, and I have every reason to be satisfied with the results. It certainly economizes room. There may be a spare place in a seat, but a single woman coming in does not like to occupy it, if she has to crush past two or three men to get to it. Where the sexes are divided there is no such delicacy, nor need there be. The people fell naturally into the arrangement, and I have never heard a grumble about it. I should have wished, if possible, to carry it through the whole church. But I had some impracticable people to deal with, and in the appropriated seats it could not be done.’

Another says, ‘The sexes are divided with good effect.’

Again, with regard to a new town church :—

‘I have observed a certain voluntary separation of the sexes in the seats under the pulpit and reading-desk; the male (aged) attending generally on one side. I shall encourage this; but I doubt the advantage of directly enjoining it, though it is done so, I believe, in Lutheran churches abroad with good effect, and is an ancient and primitive custom.’

One, to whose practical wisdom we attach great value, says,—

‘I think the division of the sexes an advantage. It is remarkable that without any hint from us, the congregation for the most part adopted this plan of their own accord. With very few exceptions the women sit on the south side and the men on the north; and I am not aware of any request having been made by any one, that they would so arrange themselves. I think that the persons who would be inclined to object are the middle classes, because they take their children with them to church, and they dislike the separation. The poor do not dislike it, but their children go to the school and sit with the school children. This may cause the difference of feeling.’

Under this head another remarks :—

‘The division of the sexes would be no doubt a help in carrying out the orderly arrangement, but in many places the people are prejudiced against it. Families like to sit and worship together. I have attempted to indicate my feelings on the subject, by assigning seats for the male teachers of my Sunday School on the north side, and for the female on the south side of the church; and directing the verger, when strangers enter, to follow that plan in placing them. The same sides are adhered to in seating the children of our schools.’

Our lay tourist says :—

‘The chief instance that I am acquainted with is Christ Church, Birmingham, mentioned under the last head; and here I have no doubt that the separation is the greatest possible help in promoting the orderly and quiet arrangement of the people. Knowing the general character of towns, I have very little hope that evil results can be effectually prevented in those localities without their separation.’

In very many churches this separation is more or less observed among the poor; indeed it is always found that they sort themselves more according to the divisions of their natural

estate in life, than by families. Old men are generally seen together, and old women the same, while young men invariably and properly herd with each other and come to church in company. Of young and middle-aged women the same may be always observed as their natural habit. In churches where no rule is kept as to north or south, we find particular pews, or benches, or the different sides of the same gallery, appropriated by long custom to the particular conditions of this transitory life. What is so awkward as to see a young man or young woman, isolated from his or her companions, and surrounded by those of another sex? A rustic youth feels this awkwardness so acutely that in self-defence his only resource is a certain stupid giggling behaviour, which is not desirable in itself or conducive to future good manners. The case of S. Barnabas is well known; as far as our observation goes, the congregations fall naturally into the arrangement, though, from the circumstances of the church, they are composed of that class which is said to have the strongest objection to it. How far S. Barnabas is as yet an example of a parochial church, is not for us to consider, nor in these days is it the fault of the clergy, if church congregations are not strictly parochial. Certain it is, that the division of the sexes is most advantageous, constituted as that congregation is, and that it adds much to the solemnity and to the sense of awe-inspiring exclusion from the world, which ought to be associated with consecrated places. All churches also must be liable to the intrusion of unpleasant people, and open seats of course, to some extent, more so than others; and this being the case, it will undoubtedly remove one great source of uneasiness on this score, if the sexes are necessarily divided. Even thieves go into churches to carry out their avocation, and it is better that this species of humanity, who are of the male gender, should at any rate be kept from annoying Christian ladies in the hours of prayer, as also may be said *vice versâ*.

The church of S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, is another example of this division. It was remarkable how quickly the whole congregation fell into the arrangement, the only exception, it is said, on the first Sunday, being a newly married clergyman and his bride, who manifested some unwillingness to part company. Under such interesting circumstances the relaxation for one year from ordinary duties, allowed in the Mosaic law, might be granted if demanded, after which time the question might right itself. On the second Sunday we attended ourselves in our capacity of a Remembrancer, and are able to record the most entire and willing assent of a large congregation to this separation. It was obvious that men queezed together on one side and women on the other, so as to

economize room for more than would have been convenient in a promiscuous amalgamation of bonnets and hats. Very few hints were needed from the vergers. One man, evidently of a retiring and bashful habit of mind, from sheer want of observation, sat upon the edge of a silk dress; the smallest touch, however, of the authoritative wand was quite sufficient to awaken him to a full sense of the horrors of his position and the enormity of his offence. This question will be found more and more connected with open seats as they become, which we hope they will do, the habit of the English Church. The poor adopt it already by very instinct, or from tradition, and it would be a graceful uniformity on the part of others to concede to what is plainly a natural and convenient principle as a general rule. But we shall recur to this again in our general summary as it were of the evidence collected, and meanwhile content ourselves with a conciliatory suggestion for which we have endeavoured to obtain some examples, though without much success. The body of the church might be used according to the free and open system, including the division of the sexes, while the aisles were reserved for those who preferred a more exact appropriation, without any separation of members of a family. We should certainly prefer seeing all after one model, but there would be a kind of balance of advantages in allowing a peculiar and exclusive privilege only in the side aisles, while the unprivileged, who comply with the natural and established rules of the church, occupy the main central part of the building. There is a dignity about the body of the church which would ever prevent its being an *inferior place*; and whatever system was adopted in it would be the rule, and anything else the exception, on the very same principle that at present open benches are often an ignominious exception to the pews in the body of the church. We know of one church where this plan is adopted with good effect. It is not, however, our place specially to advocate it, for we only suggest it as a less evil, and as carrying a less flagrant show of injustice, than appropriating every privilege to the rich, and leaving every fair and open principle to be the despised portion of the poor.

We will now consider open seats as tending to wear away the notion of property in a church. That this is an evil no one can doubt, except those persons who maintain the reverse for their own personal interests. It is obvious that private property in a church is spoliation from the public rights of churchmen. If such claims could be legally substantiated, all that the Church would be able to say would amount to this, 'I imagined this building mine, but I find it is not, so I must get a building elsewhere.' The Church must have buildings of her own; she

of ground thus appropriated, even if the further evil is spared of those pews being made absolutely private property for purposes of rent and traffic. In some places these evils have grown up to such an extent that the church is no longer a place to which the clergyman can invite his parishioners. He is rather the private chaplain to certain pew-owners. A few years ago there was great danger of the Church being altogether swamped in her public character by these claims, and consequent exclusion of all but a few privileged persons; now, however, things are much improving, and precedents in a legal sense of the word are now going against this spoliation rather than for it, which is a hopeful sign for the future. Carried to a certain extent, it is obvious that the clergy must be driven to perform their offices elsewhere. Those offices are surely of primary importance to the place in which they are to be performed, and therefore if the accustomed place is taken from them, as regards the poor they must seek for another place, and in a parish in Gloucestershire, a new church has actually been built near the old one, because the old one, though amply large enough, has no room for the poor.

We suggested this advantage of open seats to our correspondents, as tending to wear away notions of property in a church, and so self-evident did it appear to all, that few remarks were added to a strong affirmative.

In one case, a clergyman speaking of his own church, which is a town parish church, lately restored, says :—

‘ This will be undoubtedly the case. The whole of the sittings have been redistributed under a commission, and the churchwardens have been strictly enjoined by the Chancellor, whenever a change takes place in the occupation of a house, to let the seat attach to the *persons* still, if they continue in the parish, and under no circumstances to allow the *same seat* to be occupied by the new occupants of the house in question; in order that the idea of church sittings being attached to a dwelling-house may be destroyed.’

In this case, the question of property is not left solely to the openness of the pews, for the appropriation implied by these remarks must need a further remedy, beyond the absence of doors; but still we find that the openness of church sittings and precautions against personal rights go together. The remarks of our lay correspondent, however, are so much to the point on this subject, that we shall continue it in his words :—

‘ I imagine that the best practical proof of this proposition (that open seats tend to wear away the notion of property in a church) will be found in the almost universal opposition made to the introduction of open seats on the ground, that thereby persons would lose “their pews.” I have found it the most common line of objection, more than even the cry of “Popery,” and even where this latter has been made use of, it seems to have been principally to serve as a more decent cloak for the other and

more real objection. And it is natural that they should cling to their pews, if there be many places in which, as at Chertsey, in Surrey, the possession of a pew entitles to a vote for the county. This instinctive feeling in the minds of men that open seats will tend to wear away the notion of property in a church, leads to the most determined opposition, which is often too successful, at least for a time. At Kidderminster, proposals were made some years ago to remove all the pews, and Lord Ward agreed to bear all the expense of it, if the people would consent; but the mayor and some of the middle classes refused to give up their pews, on the simple ground that they *were their pews*, and that they could not be turned out. The mayor said, that "if they wanted to build a poor man's church, he would subscribe to it, but that he would not give up his pew, even if he stood alone in it." Others said the same. One of the churchwardens, at a time considerably subsequent to this, endeavoured to seize on a pew by inserting a false floor raised some inches above the old one, placing a lock on the door and marshalling his family in on Sundays; doubtless intending to raise a permanent barrier against the further introduction of open seats in that part of the church: as he had done it on his own private authority, and was a very factious man, the other churchwarden dealt summarily with him, and ordered the lock and false floor to be removed in the course of the week. The existence of locks on the doors of pews, and tables, soft cushions, fire-places, &c. inside, are so many standing witnesses to the fact that high pews tend naturally to foster the notion of property in a church, and therefore, as a necessary consequence, that open seats, in which none of these things can find place, must tend to wear away such a notion. In common with every one else, I know too many such cases. There is more than one locked pew in — Church, one of which has been kept practically empty, for a display of political enmity against a gentleman who wished for it. In Walton Church, (Surrey,) there is a pew, jealously guarded, not merely by a lock and bolts, but furnished with iron spikes all round the top. Some few years ago, two ladies went into a church at Brighton, and at the request of the "pew opener" were ungraciously admitted into a very large pew, occupied by one lady: when the sermon was over, she came up to them, and displaying a large key, asked "whether they wished to stay for the sacrament, as she always locked up her pew." Of course the intruders retired, and the lady made her property secure. There can be little doubt that she would have considered a proposal to introduce open seats as a great violation of her rights. At Cobham, in Surrey, several persons, not content with building themselves private galleries in the church, appropriated each one of the windows, turning the centre light into a glass door to give admittance to the gallery, and building a staircase from the outside up to it. At Shepperton, (Middlesex,) under the old system, a single lady had possession of the chief pew in the church, which she inhabited alone. A gentleman fancying that he had a right to the same pew, the following scene was transacted every Sunday. The lady hurried very early into church and locked herself into her pew; in process of time the gentleman came, and placing a form outside the pew, scrambled over the side and thus triumphantly asserted his rights. About the same time all the pew-holders put locks upon the doors of their pews, whereat the poor complained bitterly that they were being locked out of the church. In more than one place I have seen some portion of the rood screen allowed to escape the general ruin, on purpose to barricade or dignify the family pew of the squire. The notions of private property in a church, of which all these things are at once the manifestations and the nourishment, must be seriously weakened, and in time very probably quite rooted out, by the introduction of uniform open seats throughout the church, more particularly if they were not fastened into their places. The idea of personal property, the only tenure

whereof was a moveable oak seat, or part of one, would soon become vague and undefined. There appears to be no need to multiply instances of an evil which must be familiar to every one, nor would it be easy perhaps to select any instance so outrageous as to be incapable of parallels in many other places.'

The general state of the law with regard to pews, with its indefinite claims and perplexing precedents, is a great hindrance in many places to church restoration. It requires great courage to face the kind of opposition which some are enabled to make, who are determined on preserving their so-called property. We have but to refer our readers to Mr. Oliphant's '*Law of Pews*' to convince them of the difficulty of saying absolutely what you have a right to do and what you have not. It is no wonder that unlettered or even lettered churchwardens succumb entirely to an asserted right, or let the whole question settle itself without any interference whatever. Yet such a course on the part of the authorities of the Church perpetuates and strengthens the evil each generation. If allowed to go on unheeded, the Church would find at some future time her places of worship openly claimed as private property; the law giving its sanction without any apparent spoliation, but simply on the ground of simplifying what is, obviously and to all practical purposes, private property, and clearing individuals of obsolete and troublesome claims on it. The law alters with habit and actual practice, and, if precedents of what may be esteemed the general custom for a certain length of time can be brought forward in evidence, the judges will not decide against it. This principle was apparent, in matters of doctrine and Church discipline, as recently tried in the Hampden and Gorham cases; and in Church property, we may be sure that all theories of openness and freedom would share the same fate, when brought in legal opposition to the overwhelming force of a whole nation's acknowledged practice. Luckily, however, the question has not come to this pass yet, and the reaction already existing, as a fact, must operate very powerfully on all legal decisions. It is, moreover, an invidious thing in the present state of feeling to assert any claims of a very selfish character against the interests of a parish. If circumstances, however, connected with the first suggestion of restoring a church, give any excuse to take the ground of mere resistance against a supposed neglect of personal respect, there are plenty still who will be very troublesome opponents. Such excuses will be assumed often without just cause; but as a matter of prudence, it is well carefully to avoid any use of irritating arguments, or any legal defiance, lest public opinion should support an opponent under such circumstances, when it would not, if he were clearly seen to be acting a mere selfish part.

Any appeal to law is to be deprecated at present. It may be necessary sometimes, but experience shows that very much may be done in a quiet way, and especially by a diligent exercise of their proper offices by the authorities of the Church. The question now seems to be in that state, when an adverse decision, resulting from some peculiar circumstances of the case, might be a general discouragement, not at all to be counter-balanced by the chance of a favourable judgment, because time itself is now working the very ground on which future law will be established. It is more wise to keep hold of the popular arguments, than to face the danger of encountering notions of property, which may, perchance, be difficult to destroy, even in law, however unjust they may be. Let, however, cases of assumed right, by faculty or otherwise, be clearly understood and singled out in any attempted restoration; let not a difficult case of such claim protect a whole row of pews by an indefinite supposition that all may be alike. The following letter, extracted from the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*, we commend as having this in view:—

Nottinghamshire.—East Retford.—Selling and letting of Pews.—Archdeacon Wilkins has addressed the following letter to the churchwardens of East Retford:—"I am informed that it has become a practice with some of those claiming a right over certain pews in our parish church to sell or let them to various persons at an annual rent,—a practice perfectly illegal, and which, if permitted to continue, would operate injuriously against the common rights and privileges of the parishioners at large, and to the prejudice of the Church itself. I request you, therefore, to transmit to me the names and addresses of such persons, that I may cite them to show their faculties, or to prove their prescriptive rights to any such pews as are appurtenant to those houses, or as are described in the faculties, that I may limit the appropriation of them to the occupiers of these houses, and to none other, and that the illegal sale and barter in all such may be arrested. I have further to request that where no such faculties or legal prescriptive titles are forthcoming, you, with the advice of the minister, may place the parishioners forming the congregation in the manner and order prescribed by the regulations and laws of the Church."

If archdeacons generally were thus to incite churchwardens to examine into cases of claim, and present them to a superior authority, how many shadowy ideas of possession, which are growing into more fixed tenures by length of time, would at once disappear. The multitude, by this means, will be transferred into advocates of a free system, inasmuch as finding their own claims entirely unsupported, they will be jealous of some one or two pews still remaining; and this feeling of jealousy is a powerful instrument in eradicating, by very shame, those few claims which are legally privileged. We know an instance of an obdurate gentleman, who required, when a church was rebuilt, that in the elegant new arrangements he should have

a pew the sides of which were some five or six feet high. As he showed fight in his claims, and was the only troublesome case, his request was conceded; not, however, by disfiguring the appearance of the church with so elevated an enclosure, but by sinking the floor of that one pew, so as to gain the desired height of sides. The gentleman therefore descends into his pew, and as representing the height of pride and the depth of humility, affords an instance of extremes meeting. No one, however, can doubt that by thus exposing so obstinate a claimant to the ridicule of all around him, the claim will soon be extinct.

With regard to legal rights in a church, there are two points which lead to much misapprehension. The one is where, by an unjust bargaining, the churchwardens in time past have obtained a faculty for repewing the church, and have collected money on the understanding that seats are appropriated, in fact given, for ever at so much a head to subscribers; pews are now claimed in many churches because so much money was given to the repewing. Now the fact of building and repairing a pew is received as evidence in favour of a legal claim, but this only when brought in proof of an old faculty or other right; where the origin of such a practice is manifest, and is seen, moreover, to have been unjust, no claim whatever is established by it: nor is the general faculty of any use to establish all the minor arrangements the churchwardens made with individual subscribers. It was only to enable the churchwardens to make those alterations which they saw convenient, presuming of course that they would be guided by law and justice, and therefore not sanctioning anything which they did that was unjust. Such appropriation, therefore, was only in exercise of the common power of churchwardens to arrange the congregation. It was a private agreement between the churchwardens and subscribers that the former would use their power of appropriation, if the latter gave their money to the church. The faculty had nothing to do with it, and the churchwardens, even if they promised more than a common appropriation, did so without any right. The money paid was in law a voluntary offering to the church, involving no claim whatever; in fact, it is absurd to imagine that the small price of putting a few boards together should establish so great an invasion of public rights; as well might any one carry a house made of cast iron into the middle of Hyde Park, rear it up, and because a gatekeeper, for a small fee, said it was all right, imagine that he had established a claim to the site of his house. In that subscription to the church the only expense considered was the mere seat, but there are many other things in a church which must be taken into account before a legal transfer could be supposed, even if

legal at all. In estimating the value of any right, it is necessary to include all privileges connected with it, and if only one trifling part of those privileges has been paid for, the presumption is that the right conferred is equally trifling. For purposes of public worship there is more than a seat required, and more is enjoyed by those who have church pews; there is a roof and a building to protect it, to maintain which church-rates are collected, and in which, therefore, all ratepayers continue to have an interest; consequently, without going into the case of demanding any greater possession of a pew than its use during public worship, it is unreasonable to assume any more authoritative appropriation, simply because a seat has been paid for, under circumstances thoroughly known, than is in the common province of churchwardens to allot.

Another common misapprehension is with regard to galleries; it is supposed that they are under a different law to the rest of a church. The same argument just used will apply as well to the erection of a gallery as to a seat in the body of the church. The building of a gallery is no private work, which does not affect other interests. The same roof covers all, and all rest on the same ground. Moreover, a gallery may injure seats under it, and in an architectural point of view there is a public right to preserve the original church in its correct form. From these considerations it follows, that the same powers which rule the body of the church must set the conditions on which a gallery is built. The cases brought forward by Mr. Oliphant explain this subject satisfactorily. He shows the erection of a gallery to be a parish act, exactly the same as if the ground of the church was enlarged. If private parties are allowed to build a gallery for their own use, they have no other tenure than the ordinary appropriation of churchwardens, unless they have a special faculty similar to one they might have had in the body of the church. There is no faculty of right attached to a gallery, as a gallery. The probable cause of the common mistake on this subject is, that the age of building galleries and that of granting faculties were somewhat identical, and therefore that many galleries have specific faculties, though many others pretend to have them, which have not; for a general faculty to build it means nothing; any private right must be supported by a private faculty to an individual.

Further than this we cannot enter into the distinctive province of legal rights, but must refer to the useful works on the subject at the head of our article. Mr. Fowler's little treatise is so easy of access, so plain and unpretending in its character, yet so comprehensive in its information, that to transcribe its pages

into our review would be as unnecessary as to go over the same ground with it, when our readers can so easily obtain the book for themselves. We commend it for the general perusal of churchwardens, and all who take interest in the practical restoration of churches, and for this purpose, recommend a cheaper edition, for half-a-crown is enough to exclude it from many houses where it might do much good, and moreover, the appearance and size of it does not quite justify that sum in this age of cheap literature. Coming, as it does, from a layman and a lawyer, it is calculated to carry more weight with it in many people's minds than what might be set down as the rhapsody of an ecclesiastic.

Another proposition which we suggested to our correspondents was the following:—

‘That they promote general reverence of behaviour, and bring out the congregational character of our services.’

To which we have the following answers:—

‘All persons must admit the truth of this proposition. Without any request from me, the example of two or three devout persons has had such an effect upon the whole body, that they now naturally stand at the Doxology and other parts of the service, when, in the churches round, the careless and slovenly manner of the last century prevails. Kneelings are provided for all, and the majority use them, in time I hope all will do so. The responses are more attended to, and the whole character of the service, which is choral, is improved. To show the evil of high backed seats, I might mention, that a youth was detected smoking a cigar a short time ago behind the pews in a church in this town. Such a thing could not have occurred in my church. Many in my congregation have been dissenters, and at first were accustomed to put on their hats as soon as they rose to leave the church; this practice they have been shamed out of, and the change I attribute to the low seats in a great measure.’

Another Clergyman writes—

‘I have found it so. Outwardly I now call mine (measuring them by the average) a devout congregation. The larger proportion of them kneel, which in the old church not one in ten did. But to procure this desirable end, you must provide hassocks, and see also that the seats are wide enough apart, (ours are three feet two inches,) otherwise you will only get “make-believe” kneeling. The great fault of most of our open seats hitherto has been, that the seat itself, and the space between the rows, have been both too narrow and uncomfortable.’

The above remarks we commend to our readers' special attention. The seats there instanced were the result of no ordinary care and experience, in the pattern selected and the space allowed for them. In one old church, visited for hints in the making of them, it was observed that the seats were slightly hollowed out, the result of which was found so very advantageous in the ease of posture afforded, that it was adopted, and is thought a great improvement.

Several return under this head a mere affirmative ; and in some cases we have observed, more especially in conversation, a hasty passing over of the question, with the remark, that they are afraid it makes but little difference. In some of these cases, however, we suspect that the duty of outward reverence does not come very prominently forward in the teaching of the Clergy attached to the church. Open seats promote reverence where a good example is set, because they increase the force of example generally ; but they are quite capable even of a contrary effect where the example of others is bad, or no great point is made of reverence in behaviour. All we expect of the Church system is, that it shall be a fair machinery for the infusion of proper teaching ; we do not require it to have a spontaneous effect, though still we believe, that good behaviour is so instinctively attached to the religious services of the Church, that publicity in their performance will have great power in teaching it, and compelling it even from unwilling minds.

Another correspondent says—

‘ People can kneel all in one direction, without interfering with one another, or exciting notice, whence it produces an unity and intensity (as far as the fit use of outward means can assist), in the devotions of the people.’

Under this head we also find another useful suggestion as to the formation of open seats :—

‘ I think one point not sufficiently considered in the “lowness” of the backs of seats. The back of one seat should form the rail for another when the congregation are kneeling, and the lower the seats are the more readily are people disposed to gather together closely.’

Many of the advantages of open seats do, in reality, depend on their being well made. They may be so uncomfortable that they defeat the benefit they are calculated to produce. The essentials are found, by experience, to be a low wide seat, a low back, slightly inclined backwards, with a small horizontal book-shelf or elbow-rest for the seat behind, and plenty of space to kneel down in. In S. Mary Magdalene’s Church there are no hassocks, and good cocoa matting is, to our taste, quite sufficient ; for kneeling on the ground we conceive to be a more easy position of the body, one that balances itself better than kneeling on a height. We speak of course of a body in health and strength ; infirmity is the exception, and should have its special provisions. The ordinary arrangements ought always to be on the presumption of health and strength. In kneeling on the ground the whole body rests easily on that part of the knee endued by nature with a strong protecting bone, but in kneeling on an elevated hassock, that part of the knee is brought to bear which

is peculiarly tender, and therefore it is that people are compelled to sit, while they pretend to kneel. Again, some room is saved in front by kneeling on the ground; for when the knees are elevated, the body, if it has not recourse to the expedient of sitting, has a tendency to lean forward and rest against the desk in front; in short, it cannot remain upright, and must go backwards or forwards, whereas, in kneeling on the ground nothing more is wanted than the rail or shelf, just spoken of, belonging to the seat in front, perpendicular to the knees. On the supposition, then, of reverential kneeling, the seats must be placed wide apart, in proportion to the height of the hassocks, in order to produce an easy posture. Where persons find difficulty in the act of going down so low, or rising up, they must provide otherwise, but as regards the ease and capacity of the body to remain in the posture of kneeling for any length of time, we feel assured that the lower the knees are the better.

We conclude this head with the following more extended and interesting communication:—

‘ This position follows in a great measure as a necessary consequence of the truth of the last. It is morally impossible that those persons, who exalt themselves above their brethren in one manner in the house of God, should evince no signs of the same spirit in other things also. I have frequently noticed that the irreverence of certain members of a congregation is in proportion to the greater magnitude of the pew. In a small district church well known to me, one of the congregation presuming on her importance, or, which is practically much about the same thing, the relative importance of her pew, was accustomed to dictate magisterially what hymns should be sung, and was not slow to express her disapprobation in case of any violation of her will. In another church, very near to the last-mentioned, the Vicar having suppressed the hymn-book altogether, the representative of one of the largest pews in the church was, and is to this day, guilty of the gross and rebellious irreverence of finding any hymn of the same metre as the psalm which is being sung, and singing it out to the same tune, in defiance of the Vicar and to the scandal of many of the congregation. I believe there are other large pews in the same church responsible for a similar irreverence. In ——— church there is in one pew a table, the use of which is in no respect clear, except to enable the occupants, or some of them, to sit at the table instead of kneel on their knees. In the chief pew in the church of S. Ives, Cornwall, I remember two tables, or rather desks, equally useful, except that there the occupiers of the pew would either lounge over them, or *sometimes* kneel round them, so as to look into each other's faces. I remember some years ago, there were two families who sat together in a pew in Christ Church, (Newgate Street,) London, and though they could not dispute about the possession of the pew, they did dispute about the pre-eminence of places in it. So that there was a regular race every Sunday for the top places; and I heard one of the contending parties relate rather an acrimonious dispute, which took place in the church about the priority of seats. At Chertsey, in Surrey, there was something of the same kind, but still worse. Two ladies always quarrelled for the top seat in a pew: one, who lived near the church, kept a look-out for the approach of her rival, and then darted into church and took possession of the top of the pew. One Sunday, the

defeated lady, seeing no other help, asked her neighbour to hand her a prayer-book, to reach which she had to get up: in a moment the other one darted into the place thus left vacant, and thought she was safe for that day at least; but the rival lady sat down in her lap, and such an altercation commenced, that the priest came out of the desk, and sharply rebuked them both.

'These scandalous irreverences were all voluntary, but there are many which are scarcely in the choice of those who sit in pews to commit or abstain from. In many pews it is almost impossible to kneel down.

'In Ilfracombe church I could manage it by kneeling along the pew, but if there were many persons in it besides myself, I was obliged, more than once, to give it up altogether. In one or two churches near Dublin, I found the seats so constructed as to render kneeling, except by turning my back on the altar, scarcely practicable. The congregations seemed to acknowledge the difficulty, and either knelt on the seat, leaning over the backs of the pews, or stood upright, or sat still.

'The irreverence of talking or sleeping in church I pass by, because it may be committed under any circumstances, although the high pew system is unquestionably the mother and nurse of this, as of so many other profanations of the house of God. Under shelter of the high walls of a pew, people wax bold to do things, which, were their actions open to the eyes of men, they would not dare to do so. I have sometimes been disturbed throughout a whole service by the conversation of others in the next pew, whom there was no possibility of requesting to behave more reverently, without a process of climbing which would have made the remedy fully as bad as the evil itself.

'Still persons will say, as they have said to myself frequently, when in conversation on such matters, that these evils arise from the state of the heart, not from the size of the pew, or the height of its sides, and that precisely the same things may take place in open seats. Without entering into the question critically, which would probably show the above statement to be, as usual, a compound of truth and error, it will be better and more appropriate to the nature of these remarks, which respect simply my own personal knowledge, testimony, and experience, to say simply, that as a matter of fact I believe that assertion to be a great mistake; if it be meant to imply that where there are open seats these same abuses are *equally* found. In every church that I know, where the seats are open, there is far more reverence (taking it as a whole, and making an average calculation) than in those churches where high pews remain. I was particularly struck with this contrast a very few years ago in Penzance. In the great church, where there were pews, there was a great deal of general irreverence visible throughout the service; while at a new chapel, or district church, S. Paul's, I believe, which I attended the same day, the congregation being all in low seats, (I forget whether all were open, or whether there were some low doors,) I saw more reverence of demeanour over the whole congregation, which was, for the size of the chapel, very large, than it has ordinarily been my privilege to witness. At Littlemore, also, which I attended occasionally during my Oxford life, there was every appearance of great reverence. And as regards the congregational character of our services, I fear this is prized but lightly by those who support pews, because they are "more private" and "quiet" than the open seats. All the paraphernalia of brass rods and red curtains, &c. &c. seem designed especially to exclude the notion of our services being congregational, or of "common prayer" altogether. In several churches which I remember (I may make particular mention of Ilfracombe), if all the congregation knelt down properly, any one might stand at the west end and not see a single person in church, except perhaps in the pews close to him. Some

of the pews at the east end of Ilfracombe church are six feet high. As a type of the advantage of open seats in making the services more truly congregational, S. Barnabas may serve instead of a whole string of less perfect examples.

'A high pew carefully fenced off from all communion with even its fellow-pews, and raised sublime above the poor "free seats," is no inapt symbol of a supreme and contemptuous and truly independent private judgment, which, as the advocates thereof love to express it, makes religion a matter wholly and solely between the individual man and his Maker. The communion of saints seems a little out of place in such a creed.'

The last proposition to which we shall here give any methodical order is the following :—

'That their adoption does, as a general rule, promote the cause of the Church among the poor, by giving them certain positive advantages, both of comfort and situation, and also by setting before them the equality of Christian worship.'

In reply to this we read from one quarter :—

'My people are mostly poor, and any distinction in the seats would have had the effect of driving them away. Numbers attend our daily service in consequence of the comfort they enjoy at church.'

Another says :—

'I do believe that the people feel that they have some property in the church, and can worship without respect of persons, as far as the first subordinations of life allow. There is nothing, indeed, more difficult to arrange than an adjustment of pews. At Yarmouth it caused great discontent in one or two parties; but as these rights manifestly were at variance with the general benefit, they have been lost in the feeling of the rest. Nor do I believe that even they would now advocate a return to the old system. It is one great means to *popularize* the Church as an institution to meet the spirit of the times, and resist the outward pressure, for the old state of things was adapted to quite a different view of both spiritual and political relations and intelligence.'

Again :—

'There can be no doubt, as open seats become more general, and the theory of congregational worship is better understood, that the prejudices of a past generation will wear out, and our posterity will wonder what the religion of their forefathers could have been, when wealthy people boxed themselves up in huge square tall pews, half as big again as their necessities required, and left the poor, the aged, and the infirm to sit in such out of the way corners as they might chance to find.'

The relations between rich and poor vary much in town and country. The same persons, who fall into the most exclusive notions when in London, almost from the necessity of the case, feel very different when surrounded by their own labourers and dependents in the country. Let, however, the true spiritual position of the poor be fostered where it may. There is no occasion for country places to labour under difficulties, so strongly felt in London, but which may be more easily overcome on their own parts. The *general* tendency of open seats towards

this wholesome equality is borne witness to by the experience of our *tourist* :—

‘As far as my experience carries me, I can give unqualified testimony to the proposition. In many places,—Kidderminster, Chippenham, may stand as instances,—I have met with proofs of this. At Kidderminster, when the church was opened first after the alterations, very few poor comparatively were present; the reason which they gave, to those who inquired the reason, was commonly, that they supposed that that was only meant for the gentry and not for them: they thought they would not be admitted at the reopening. However they very soon learnt that the beautiful church was for them as much as for others, and, for a considerable time, it was filled to overflowing. The daily service, I should say, has been far more numerous attended than before, and I know that many of the poor take more delight in the Church and her services. Of course, in a place like Kidderminster, the stronghold of all separation since the days of Baxter, this effect can only be very partial; but still I am persuaded that such has been the result, and I think I may say that the open seats have very much conduced to it. In many places I have heard the poor lament over the pews, as practically excluding them from the church, and they, like the Mayor of Kidderminster, began to think that a poor man’s church must be a different kind of thing altogether; and I agree with them, the churches must in this particular be changed, if we are to lay any very firm hold on the affections of the poor. What a poor man would think of a church, where the altar was thrust westwards to make room for a great pew behind, I do not know! certainly he would not suppose it was done for his use or spiritual advantage. This was done in a church in Worcestershire. I have seen the pew, but have some impression that it has been removed, though I am by no means certain. In the following churches, also, I know that pews have been exchanged for open seats with the happiest results :—S. Martin’s, Salisbury; Coombe Bassett and Woodford, both near Salisbury. The congregations, in all these cases, have increased exceedingly since the alteration, and that not from the poorer classes only, but from all. In one case I am informed that the congregation has nearly doubled.’

The advantages of the poor are much brought in contact with the prejudices of the rich, in all proposals of making church seats free and open. Therefore, as a corollary to the last proposition, we endeavoured to elicit any remarks our correspondents were enabled to make on the chance of those hostile prejudices wearing away. In reply to this, our above-quoted most able and valuable helpmate in our present article gives his experience as follows :—

‘That the prejudices of the middle classes may be overcome to these arrangements, may be inferred from the fact of the existence of these arrangements in many places where they were not some time ago; for I fear there are not many cases in which the alterations were made without opposition. In Shepperton there was a furious opposition, which was not overcome till long after the alterations had actually been made, a vote in vestry deciding in favour of it in the teeth of the adverse faction. By degrees, however, it wore away, and I should think that all parties now are perfectly reconciled to it. At Kidderminster, patience, and reasoning, and preaching, have at last been successful; and by this time I hope there are no pews left, either in the body of the church or in the aisles. The galleries and their pews are

at present, I fear, beyond reach, and they are the worst abuses of all. Even the mayor, who was so obstinate when the same thing was proposed before, and whom I heard declaiming in the streets, the next Sunday, against "all Roman doings," has signified his consent, perhaps not persuaded, but for some reason rendered malleable. At Ilfracombe, the Vicar told me that he did not expect any serious opposition to the proposal, which he will make as soon as the money can be raised, and spared from the building of a new church which is in progress. At Trowbridge it has been done, and gives, I believe, gratification to all. At —, if we had the money, I have great hopes that we might succeed in weaning the people over, except perhaps in one or two instances, where it seems to be a point of honour to hold by the pews, equally with other things that hinder the restoration of the church. But even these cases, which appear so stubborn, may, by little and little, be sometimes brought over. I know one or two instances of persons holding out alone for a long time, hoping to hinder thereby the whole work; and, at last, when it has been done without them, coming and begging that their pew might be removed also. At Chippenham the prejudices have been successfully surmounted, except in the case of one lady, who still holds "her own;" and a kind of compromise seems to have been effected with the mayor and corporation, who have now seats made like the rest, only with doors, and rather higher, so as to be easily distinguishable from the surrounding crowd; but yet are far, very far better than the old-fashioned "corporation pews."

We shall now bring the general collection of testimony in favour of the open-pew system, with which we have been kindly furnished, to a close, by giving one letter entire, as its general character would have been lost if dissolved into parts:—

"I feel that both my parish and myself are of too rustic a character to furnish any satisfactory answers to methodical inquiries like yours. We are not in circumstances to say anything at all to most of them. Meanwhile this is the sort of result we have found among ourselves. The people are vastly pleased to have the Squire and the ladies mixed up, for their prayers and instructions, among themselves, and have a very comfortable feeling that, so far, we are all right, and that what Scripture says, and what we do, agree very well together. Then, it is evident that they leave off ugly habits of their own, and adopt very seemly ones, from those whose reverent behaviour at church is a part of their good breeding, taking the course of devotion. Thus, almost all learn to do as they should; and any offence is seen by all, and is a nuisance to all. All know, too, that it cannot be hid, whether they are at church or not; the Parson sees all without staring, and is heard of all without screaming. There are, indeed, drawbacks, real or pretended. Thus the farmer who will take two goblets of ale at his good Sunday dinner, when one would have been enough, goes fast asleep still, and snores, and lays it upon the fatigue given to his stout back by being kept bolt upright, with nothing to rest his shoulders or his head; but his wakeful labourer, in the next bench after him, sets the matter right, and shows how the world goes in the church as well as out of it. There will also arise disputes about places, from time to time; but they are much more easily settled and traced straight home to ill tempers, and not to real inconveniences. And certainly the whole character of the congregation, and so of the parish generally, has vastly improved under the open-seat system, and I am commonly asked whether the people were always as attentive and well-behaved as they are now. I have nothing more to add, &c."

Two other letters also, which we are unwilling to exclude, have arrived too late to be placed under the several heads we have been considering; we therefore leave them to be arranged, in a retrospective manner, by our readers.

The first is from a country Clergyman of most varied acquaintance with the ecclesiastical arrangements in all countries and ages.

'A new parochial district was formed in Yorkshire, and the church consecrated fourteen months ago. The seats are all open, and all are unappropriated except about six pews; and, except in these pews, the sexes are divided. The clergyman finds this arrangement work extremely well; it admits of the church being used with ease and success by the whole of the parishioners. On all Sacrament days, the morning service is divided, with entire acquiescence on the part of the congregation, and services are multiplied without any difficulty.

'My own opinion is entirely favourable to open and unappropriated seats, and the division of the sexes. At the consecration of a church in a large town some few years ago, I met a numerous body of clergy at an Inn, and took the opportunity to ask if any of them had divided the sexes in their churches. Three of the clergy replied that they had done so; and they said it worked so extremely well, that if the clergy in general would only try the same plan, they would all like it.'

The opportunities of our other correspondent are stated by himself:—

'1. In my last parish, in Kent, I had a favourable opportunity of observing the results of the open-seat system in a chapel of ease which was built in a distant hamlet, and where unquestionably it worked very beneficially. I will, therefore notice, *seriatim*, your questions so far as I can in any way assist you. Some of the open seats were appropriated to the principal farmers in the most eligible parts of the chapel; but, although appropriated, were never, or scarcely ever, empty. For in the absence of the parties to whom they were appropriated, they were occupied by others; or, when the chapel was very full, the room not occupied by members of the particular families, was filled by those who required accommodation. I cannot say that I found the congregation assembled in the best parts of the chapel, when room was not an object, for even in the unappropriated parts regularity of attendance seemed to secure one and the same seat or seats to the same parties; and I have frequently noticed that, when such parties have not been early at church, the seats have for a time been left unoccupied, presuming on the certainty of attendance. Undoubtedly there was less waste of room than in the pew system; for when the *vacant* seat was needed, it was claimed even in the appropriated parts, and there appeared to be a greater desire to accommodate those in want of accommodation, than I have noticed in the old *doored-pew* system.

'2. Of this (*viz.* that open seats do not cause disorder, &c.) I think there can be no doubt. So far from observing any disturbance or confusion, I have frequently noticed (after the commencement of Divine Service) the parties, to whom seats were appropriated, taking their places in other parts of the chapel, because their own seats had been previously filled; and this without any question or difficulty.

'3. About this, (the division of the sexes,) I am not so sure. Women are more captious than men on their *rights* in church. And throughout my

experience I have had more questions raised between women, as to their particular places, than I have ever had with men.

'4. I think it will be generally found that where there is a division of sexes, the aisles must be the unappropriated, and the whole or a part [of the nave, (as the case may be,) the appropriated division of the building. The church at Great Tew, however, in Oxfordshire, is an illustration of the contrary, where, in a church of nave and aisles, the whole large area of the nave is for the poor, and the aisles for the farmers; the free sittings being much more filled than the others.

'5. There can be no doubt that they promote general reverence of behaviour; for being low as well as open, the occupants are so completely under eye, that none of those irregularities of behaviour, or want of reverence, which frequently take place within the enclosure of a pew, can occur. Shame, if no better feeling, prevents persons from attracting attention by singularity of conduct or gesture.

'6. I certainly remarked, as one of the results of the open-seat system, that there was a greater willingness to attend on the part of the poor; that no excuses were ever made on account of the position to which they were banished, and the only annoyance expressed was when residents in another part of the parish made a practice of coming to "our" chapel, as they called it, and occupied the room and accommodation which they felt had been erected for their use and benefit.

'7. Inasmuch as the poor especially take a greater interest in the open seats, I have no doubt that they would lead to the more frequent opening of churches for public, if not for private use. When first I went to —, Christmas Day and Good Friday had never been observed in the district in which the chapel of ease was built; but within three years after its erection, the observance of those days was strict, and the attendance at public worship large.

'8. When once accustomed to open seats, I do not think that any class desires to return to the old pews. The greatest difficulty is to reconcile the middle classes to a change, which, in their estimation, deprives them of distinction and dignity; but when they see their superiors occupying open seats in no respect distinguished from the poorest, they soon become satisfied.

'I do not think I can have thrown any light upon your questions, so as to help you in any respect; but I will not withhold the result of my experience, such as it is, especially as it extends over a period of eight or ten years' observation.'

There is one large branch of the subject of pews, which requires a distinct notice, apart from any remarks that have yet been dwelt on: we mean the question of pew rents in district churches. The original theory of openness and freedom, which, more or less, is still legally attached to old parish churches, had been so far forgotten in practice, as a necessary element of Christian worship, that when, in later times, the need of fresh churches was forced upon the public, the system of pew rents was resorted to as the foundation and support of Church extension. Parliament issued Church Building Acts, authorizing and regulating the system, bargaining only for a small share of the church to be free, for the use of the poor, and not making any conditions as to the position of those seats. In London and other populous

districts, the great church-going population of the middle classes are now habituated to this system, for their religion has long depended on it; the peculiar privilege of a parish church being confined to a very few in such parishes, for instance, as S. Pancras, or Birmingham. The whole state of things, in a social aspect, is, moreover, so very different in these situations to what it is in moderate sized or country parishes, that there is a peculiar difficulty in urging the *equality* argument against such purchasing of religious privileges. For quiet and respectable people, who love repose on the Sunday, who pay their way in other things and are willing to do so in religion, without any notion, either in themselves or others, of munificent offerings to the Church, there is a great charm in taking a seat in the neighbouring church, to which they may go or not as the humour takes them, but in which they are undisturbed when they do go. The idea of neighbourhood, which gives reality to the congregational feeling of a small parish,—where all know each other in their respective positions either of master, labourer, buyer, seller,—is extinct where nobody knows who lives next door; and spiritual equality with the greengrocer is neither sought for, nor is much considered among the various items of social economy. The advocacy of open churches will, therefore, require a greater amount of unsupported faith in London than in the country. Nor are the difficulties likely to decrease; on the contrary, if things go on as we should desire, they will much increase, as the lower classes are brought into the question by a greater wish to go to church. It is but reasonable that we should consider the different relations which subsist between the rich and the poor under these different circumstances of locality. In the country, your poor neighbours are men who work in your fields, whose cottages you visit, whose wives you talk to and help in their troubles, and whose children go to your school, and who themselves greet you on meeting, in recognition of your office or station,—whether that be lay or cleric. A country parish is a family, the members of which are really known to each other, or between whom there is really felt to be a bond of union, either in the working of the Church, or even in the periodical gathering together of the main body of masters in a parish meeting, in order to regulate all parochial matters of general interest. There is a chance also here of the very worst of your neighbours leaving the place, because their habits find no encouragement or field for their exercise. In such a place, there is a sensation of the various classes of society being within the scope of individual sympathy, and therefore it is a manageable thing to impress on well-disposed people the benefit of this parochial family worshipping God on an equal footing

within those walls consecrated to religion. Contrast this with London. Your neighbours there are connected by no sort of social tie with yourself, a large class of them are perfectly inaccessible, and do not want any connexion with you, except in the way of trade or employment. The few children, in proportion to the parish, whom you may know in the school, are isolated children, affording but a slender link between the clerical or lay visitor of the school, and the parents; while the lanes and alleys are inhabited not exclusively by that class of poor, over whom the necessary habits of industry are some check, but perhaps by those who are the very refuse of the whole country, who live as ministering spirits to the vices and luxury of others, and who taint the whole neighbourhood and the whole condition of poverty with a ban of exclusion from all intercourse with their respectable rich neighbours.

Under the sanction, then, of Acts of Parliament regulating the affairs of 'the Established Church,' it is no wonder that the church going population of London are altogether associated with pew rents. The practical desertion of the poor from church was not their fault, they may say; all they wish is that they may go to church quietly. Satisfying any scruples about the theoretical poor, who ought to be in the house of God, by looking at the word 'free' in some corners near the door as they enter, they shrug their shoulders, (or, if ladies, wave their dresses,) walk up in stately independence to their pew, and after well securing the latch of the door and repeating a short litany to the name of their hatter, are prepared to 'hear divine service,' with the honest consciousness that they have paid beforehand for the privilege, and that the balance of account is always in their own favour. Such is the way of the London world, though, of course, with exceptions; and for this system were the greater number of churches expressly built. The Clergy depend on pew-rents, and therefore *ex officio* are their advocates, or are perhaps helpless parties in what they do not like, but are obliged to endure. Now this would be all very well, if the church thus built only professed to be the private chapel of certain individuals who club together, and, like Micah, hire a Levite of the Establishment to be their priest, with the ephod, teraphim, and graven image of pulpit hangings, altar cushions, and all the paraphernalia of a *neat* church, and who give him victuals in the shape of an occasional invitation to dinner, and a suit of apparel, represented by a black gown from the ladies, in testimony of their esteem, and also ten shekels of silver in the form of pew rent. In this case we might excuse one church, thinking that another would supply the obvious deficiency in accommodating the poor. But the case is quite different when

these churches are meant to have, and in a sense have, a parochial territorial charge, and represent the mother Church, in all its advantages, to those within certain limits. Now in the present state of feeling which a London Clergyman finds among the poor of a parish, has he any hope of drawing them to such a church, when all the force of habit is against going at all? does he not feel it an unreal invitation, because he cannot ask them on such terms as he feels that the services of his church ought to receive them? It was surely in the first instance a rash departure from the ancient system of our Church—that by which the land was spread over with noble buildings and ample endowments—to allow the miserable substitute of pew rents to be the means on which to extend our Church to an increased population; and experience now shows, that however it may have benefited one class, yet that the poor are not included in such a system, as they were in the more ecclesiastical type; in fact, that such a church is not in any practical sense a territorial centre of the Church Catholic for the district allotted to it, in the manner which a country parish is clearly seen to be. The very principle of uniformity should have prompted the building of new churches under the same principle as the old, especially when this country owes so much to her parochial system; but experience now most amply proves, that our forefathers were wiser than this generation in such things, or, which is more to the point, were more liberal; for Providence ordains that the Church's best system shall not be one which cost her members nothing: she flourishes best on the practice of her highest virtues, on chivalrous self-denial and bountiful munificence.

The evil of pew rents is not, however, confined to the class who are altogether excluded by them; there are many whose notions of religious service altogether are much injured by the trickery and underhand work resulting from the whole system, especially among those who are ashamed of going to *free seats*, and are unwilling or unable to pay rent. On this point we have received the following communication:—

‘ In the new churches, not endowed, the question of open seats cannot be severed from the question of pew rents. It is to be remembered that in London there is a large class who are not poor (*i. e.* recipients of alms) who yet cannot pay pew rents, and to drive whom into benches distinguished as “free,” is to drive them from church; while, if the contribution to the maintenance of the church were voluntary, by a weekly or monthly collection, they would contribute more in proportion to their means than those do who now rent pews. Pew renting is a matter of business, and is treated as such. It is thought a proper economy to consider how few seats need be rented. In a family of four or five, it is thought sufficient to take two or three seats, as one will most probably be absent from church, and here is a certainty of some other vacant place in the same or a near pew, and so we can manage.” Others, yet more economical, rent no seats,

but by a liberal gratuity to the attendants, secure the seats of absentees. These things are done by people, who, if appealed to to maintain divine service, would treat the matter in a different spirit. Others, ashamed to occupy seats for which rents are asked which they cannot pay, wander from church to church, making a rule to themselves not to be at one church above once in a month, or two or three times successively. Great laxness naturally follows, or some cheap seat at a dissenting chapel attracts them. I cannot but think that, as a general rule, as liberal a provision would be made by voluntary offerings as by pew rents; but where the Clergy have not confidence enough to rely on their people in this manner, some proper sum might be fixed upon and raised by subscription through the district, on the personal application of a lay committee. Of course there is a want of independence in the clergyman where the provision is so obtained, but there must be as great a want or greater where it is obtained by pew rents.²

The present system of pew rents, with the exclusive congregations they foster, has a doctrinal evil attending it as well as being a breach of Christian morals, and especially so where the church has a district allotted to it, and thus is entrusted with the territorial charge of all members of the Church resident therein. A church thus built seems to be founded on the business-like theory, that the pew renters are the parish, and that admission to the services of the Church, except under very humiliating circumstances, is in their hands. Now, in an abstract point of view, Christians have a right to meet together and shut the doors against strangers, but this is on the supposition that the excluded persons are heathen. To shut any persons out from the full equality of Christian worship is a kind of excommunication, and is felt to be so. Yet the sacraments and ordinances of the Church are administered to this excluded class; they are in such things esteemed Churchmen; they are baptized, confirmed, married, &c., by the Church, and yet the worship of the Church is not open to them with like freedom that her sacraments are afforded. The result of which must be to make such ordinances degenerate in their minds; for an inner circle is seen to exist, of persons far more privileged than the reception of Church ordinances of itself implies; whereas all practical ideas of excommunication from the body of the church, ought to be connected with the reception or non-reception of those ordinances. To some extent this danger applies to other evils in our Church, but it admits of most clear demonstration with regard to pew rents. It seems altogether unchristian to allow any practical exclusion of those whom the true discipline of the Church admits to be her own children, nay, territorially dependent on that very Church with its Clergy. The discipline of the Church is here sunk in consideration of mammon, and her exclusion is not sacramental, but pecuniary.

But those churches would seem to require special notice

where a better system has been tried; where great sacrifices have been made to establish a more ecclesiastical type of Church extension. It is difficult to bring such churches forward in proof of any particular principle which forms part of their system, for many other questions are involved in their general working. S. Barnabas, for instance, S. Andrews, Well Street, or S. Mary Magdalene, are in a peculiar position, and whether right or wrong in what they do, they are obviously not a fair test of all points connected with open seats, though, as to the fact of congregations assembling in them quietly and orderly, they are eminent instances. A *few* churches only can indeed never be proper examples of any general principle in a place like London, and for this reason: they are filled not with a true parochial congregation, but with persons who from preference to the system there carried out, or even from curiosity, go to them, and prevent any quiet working of the Church into its own parishioners. This is not the fault of the Clergy nor of the system; for, suppose the system good, and generally adopted, there would be no motive for individuals to leave their own district, for they would have the same at home. Then, again, the question of open seats is at present involved in so many other points of theology, that with them its merits are only as yet appreciated by that class which takes general interest in Church questions of the day. Among the poor those few churches are not extensively known or distinguished from their general idea of all other churches, because the Church question, as a whole, has not yet interested them; moreover, their previous conceptions of the church as a place for rich people, must necessarily be kept up, against all effort of the Clergy to the contrary, by the numbers of rich people who flock into them and fill them. This is a necessary state of things, and has its uses; but such churches will for some time labour under the difficulty of being models and examples of certain principles, rather than being quietly let alone to work their own way as churches of a territorial division in the Church Catholic. Yet, in spite of this peculiar difficulty in such churches as we have mentioned, no one can have attended them without perceiving a far different character in the congregation to what is seen in a closely pewed metropolitan church. There is a congregational brotherly freedom, which makes a stranger feel at home and at rest. In the case of S. Andrew's, we fear that the necessity of supporting their exquisite choir, has rather kept out the considerations we are now chiefly advocating, and that there have been many concessions towards the pew-renting system; but so it must ever be, for the mind of man is not all-comprehensive; by developing one principle, the mind loses sight of another; or

rather, when bent on one object, any difficulties which present themselves assume the aspect of something to be got rid of at any risk; if money is wanted, money must be got. The principle of free and open churches has, in the other cases, however, taken a firm root, which we trust will not be torn up under any trials or temptations. The non-parochial character of such congregations must be regretted, but is no reason for altering the system; the fault lies in other churches not following their example, rather in their not conforming to the too common practice of pew rents, with all their contaminating evils.

The question of pew rents assumed last year a more offensive aspect than ever, because there was danger of its being engrafted into our Church more inextricably than at any previous time. Various schemes for Church extension among the poor have been suggested, but last year, as our readers will probably remember, the plan of very low pew rents in churches, even for sittings that had been guaranteed free for ever, and also the plan of churches specially for the poor, was hit upon, and provisions for the former were very nearly being introduced into the Church Building Amendment Act of the session. Luckily, however, this was warded off, thanks to those Churchmen who are on the alert for such things. We extract a useful letter from the *Guardian*, with its signature attached to it, which was written while this was in discussion:—

‘THE CHURCH AND THE POOR.

‘To the Editor of the Guardian.

‘SIR,—I would most earnestly call the attention of every Churchman and friend of the poor to those clauses in what is called “the Church Building Amendment Act,” now before parliament, and which would impose a rental upon free sittings—upon those seats which were given to the poor for ever, and which are therefore their own.

‘The poor, it is said, prefer paying a small sum, in order that they may ensure for themselves a sitting.—I deny it. There are amongst church-goers some persons so very poor, that they cannot spare, from their necessities, any the very smallest sum in addition to their present outgoings; the education of their children, or their continuance in a clothing club, is often prevented by the onus of a weekly penny.

‘The evils of the pew system have been again and again exposed. Pews have, in many cases, cast out the poor from our churches, and have thereby caused ignorance and schism; they induce irreverence—they lead to hatred and uncharitableness amongst neighbours.

‘I may be told that a revival of *pews* is not contemplated by this bill. But what will be the result? A bench will be appropriated for an annual payment to a family—not necessarily to a poor family; what will then follow to make it exclusive? a door—perhaps, a lock to the door—the front and back raised for *privacy*? Have we not here a legitimate pew? The last words uttered by the late Bishop Stanley in my hearing were these: “If I live six years, I do not believe there will be a pew in my diocese.” How little did he contemplate that, three years only after he spoke, a bill

would be sanctioned by some of his brethren on the bench, which would tend to undo all that he and others had been zealously striving to accomplish! What a gross breach of faith is this, as regards those munificent persons who have either built, or given money for the erection of churches, on the express condition that they should be altogether free; and thus that Christ's fold should be enlarged by admitting the poor of His flock! These rents may be applied for the benefit of the clergyman himself, or for building him a house; so that the poor will consider themselves robbed by the Church Commissioners for the benefit of their clergyman. Will this insure peace and harmony in a parish, or increase respect for the pastor? And is there no other mode of adding to a clergyman's income? Has not the Church her offertory? In ancient times one-fourth of the offerings was allotted to the clergy. What is still read from the altar? "Do ye not know that they who minister about holy things live of the sacrifice?" "Let him that is taught in the word, minister unto him that teacheth."

'I was never disposed to "stir up strife," and my object in writing this letter is "to prevent the beginning of strife," for such will unquestionably be the fruits of this bill.

'May God grant success to every effort which shall be made to arrest it in its progress!

'I am, Sir, your obedient and faithful Servant,

'Bath, June 23, 1851.

'J. H. MARKLAND.'

A private letter, also, to the writer of the above, and with reference to it, has been kindly sent for our perusal, as containing the opinion of a clergyman in a populous neighbourhood, well entitled to respect from the amount of his experience:—

'I was very glad to see, in the *Guardian* of last week but one, a letter from you, calling attention to the act of gross injustice, which, if Churchmen be not vigilant, may be perpetrated by parliament in the matter of free sittings. I quite agree with you, that a *large* majority of the poor would *not* prefer paying even a nominal sum, to receive a sitting which they can call their own. This is the case with some who have been brought up under the pew system, but it is not true of the mass, who are ready to avail themselves of Church privileges as soon as the odious distinction between rich and poor shall be generally obliterated from our churches. The iniquities of the pew system have alienated so many, that time alone will do away with the prejudices which tend to keep some persons from church, even in cases where that horrid system is abolished.'

But, it is often said, there is accommodation for the poor: so many seats are allotted to them. Now there is much absolute deception in the statistics of Church Building Societies. An imposing proportion of free seats is put before the public, but on examination this is found sometimes to include some out-of-the-way corner—under the tower, for instance, fitted up with minute benches for the school children. The law is said to be satisfied by that arrangement, and a grant, accordingly, is obtained, on the supposition of benefiting the poor by giving free seats. We heard, on one occasion, a few facts of this kind brought before a meeting of the Church Building Society, which sadly disturbed that quiet self-satisfied composure with which the Bishop in the chair, the Archdeacon and others on the plat-

form, were, according to custom, praising the immense liberality bestowed on the poor. The 'disturbing influence' stated, in an honest and straightforward manner, that the number of seats sounded well, but he feared nobody ever occupied them, which really could hardly be wondered at, considering the sort of accommodation they were. The unfortunate individual who had ventured thus far, began now to perceive the awful mistake he was making by such unpleasant allusions. Dead silence and uncomfortable looks greeted such ill-omened words, till the impression was conveyed to him, that really it was uncourteous to the Bishop to ruffle the tranquillity of his lordship's mind, and that an apology was due for perverting so amicable an assembly, to the discussion of subjects little designed for it.

We have not, as yet, noticed Mr. Stuart's Sermon, the title of which we placed at the head of our article; nor is it necessary that we should repeat what he there says on these pages;—indeed, since our first perusal of it, we have avoided any further reference to it, and for this reason. That Sermon and Appendix, with the noble example of its teaching set by the author himself in the Church of S. Mary Magdalene, are so open to all who take interest in the subject—that is, we should hope, to all Churchmen—that it is most advantageous to our present purpose simply to adduce the author, his words and works, in confirmation of all we have said. We feel that he and ourselves are aiming at one and the same object; and as our wish, at present, is not to commence an interchange of compliments between fellow-labourers, but rather to promote a certain cause, we have desired to take our own line, without any reduplication of his arguments, and in perfect independence of them.

At the commencement of our article, we pictured, as it were, certain primæval ideas of Christian worship, in order that our readers might look at all which followed through a free and natural atmosphere. It remained for us to survey the question in a practical manner, and consider how those essentials which nature and Christian morals require in our religious worship, may best be complied with under existing circumstances. Availing ourselves of the kind help of friendly experience and friendly suggestions, we have accordingly brought forward many facts and general remarks on the whole subject, which now it is becoming that we should sum up by some reflections that may seem to arise from them.

Freedom and openness to baptized members of the Church for her services and offices is an essential of Church arrangements, for otherwise there cannot be proper stress laid on the duty of Christian worship. When a congregation is assembled together, there are many great advantages in producing that

sensation in each individual's mind, which makes his service a free and voluntary act, prompted by his belief in certain spiritual benefits to be derived by it, and his desire to obtain them. Each member present should therefore feel, that what is going on is his own, that he is a component part as it were of the transaction; that the Clergy are exercising certain functions for him, and that the building itself is all his, by a common participation in it with others. One part of the church he ought to feel as much his own as another. Objects of interest may be dispersed throughout the church,—painted windows, fine and touching pieces of sculpture, corners suited for retirement, or meditations of a specific character, and other suggestive details, in which the general effect and sublimity of the Church and her services may be more gloriously contemplated. Now, each member of the Church should feel that all these are his in their turn, and that he need not be confined to one or a few of them, but that he may walk about free and open in the courts of the house of his God, and dwell on the beauty of holiness with some foretaste of celestial exemption from the barriers which earth and matter elsewhere place before him. But such considerations as these bring us at once to the general use of a church, for there are many theories on this subject, to some of which our remarks would not be applicable. That theory which places each household in a box, (we know an instance of a little child on returning from church, saying she had been in a box,) and ignores anything but the voice of the reader or preacher, is right so far as it makes the functions of the Clergy the natural focus of the building; but it is wrong in its comprehension of the nature of those functions, for it does not recognise that sacramental union which flows from them, and which makes all who come within their influence members one of another, as well as recipients of instruction from the clerical office for their individual profit; for the true grace of the Church's ministrations makes the whole building a type of a more immediate Divine presence that will be hereafter. The material building of the Church may, by another theory, be raised to be the first consideration, the Clergy being looked upon as ministers in the *Church*, rather than the Church, as but the veil and protection of clerical ministration,—holy because they are holy, consecrated by them. The consecration of churches is no charm apart from other and regular offices of religion: it has become a distinct office, because the general sanctity of all places of Christian worship is so established a rule, that it is represented in an express manner when a new church is built, as if to impart to the new comer the overflowing sanctity of its fellows, to welcome it by anticipation with the fruits of its own future ministrations, in common with

those of the whole Church Catholic. The consecration of churches arose from the typical character of Christian worship, producing a true and impressive sentiment of attachment, for that part of the material world, which is honoured with serving to heavenly purposes. The powers of art were resorted to, to carry out this idea, by making the building itself to speak of heaven and heavenly thoughts. These considerations were also seen to be in conformity with the whole type of Divine worship recorded in the Old Testament, and therefore the holiness of the place itself is thoroughly engrafted into the Church system. The holiness of Christian offices, by this means, seems to linger in the accustomed place of their performance, and not to be restricted altogether to the actual periods in which they are done. They create an abiding sanctity, a holy atmosphere in the building.

Taking therefore, what seems to us, the true view of Christian worship; that the clerical functions are the central objects of attraction, while the holiness of the building is most true and profitable, but arises out of the former, and is therefore secondary; holding these two considerations together for mutual explanation, we shall arrive at a clear insight into the proper arrangement of a church, which may best carry out the object for which it was built.

The idea of family worship in a square pew does not make the clerical functions the centre of attention any further than prompting or teaching is concerned, and its gross violation of reverence to the altar destroys every principle of the holiness of consecrated places, as it forbids any common right of enjoyment in the whole church by each member of it; it gives each family so much space and no more, and consequently so much feeling of the communion of Christian people as one family suggests, and no more. This theory therefore we notice no further. Next let us consider the somewhat better plan,—of all being placed toward the altar and the ministering Clergy, yet in closed pews. This is so far better, that the congregation looks to one centre of united worship; but still there is the want of freedom we so long for: doors shut in and shut out, give a confined sensation to some, and an excluded one to others. They prevent those present from coming close round what they wish to see and hear, and produce many evils we have been all along attributing to them. Let our readers have pity for those clergymen who have to stretch their voices over a blank space of the church, in order to reach the distant congregation. Not only is power of voice needlessly used in this, so common a case, but the comfortable feeling of addressing a company of listeners gathered round you, is lost in the cold abstraction of merely preaching a sermon from a pulpit.

Surely, then, it is a far higher type of Christian worship which is at once suggested by the absence of doors. It is to them that we owe all the distinctive marks of many evils we are now complaining of. We know a clergyman who has long been so impressed with this, that, for years, he has been on the watch to take one door away after another, from the old pews as he could persuade persons to allow him, even at the risk of a very motley appearance in the church. He was unable to restore the church according to a better system of architectural effect, yet he felt that a principle was involved in the doors, which came before any mere considerations of effect. We may also say that his success was very encouraging.

Without doors we may easily imagine a parochial congregation assembling together in perfect freedom, as in the exercise of a common privilege. Take the case of a country parish, where no great hindrances exist, such as must require special provisions to meet, a subject we shall presently consider. This is the highest type of Christian worship; the parochial family all come and join together in the services of their Church, with a real feeling of being therefore pledged to each other, as well as united under one head. Each one feels a property in the use of the whole church, and is only connected with one seat in particular, for the sake of order and propriety in the settling down of the congregation. He may always sit in the same place, or he may not, but from want of a door he attaches no peculiar or individual right to that one place as his own, beyond the preference of habit at the most. This makes a real and a legal difference, the effect of which we may depend on. In Mr. Oliphant's '*Law of Pews*,' we find this important passage:—

'The fact of a pew having formerly been open would operate very strongly against any claim to a prescription, because the difference between an open and a closed pew is so strong, that the probability is, that, so soon as the party had ascertained his rights, he would enclose; therefore, Mr. Justice Parke was of opinion that the fact of the seat having formerly been open, destroys the prescription.'

In the freedom of the parochial family thus gathering together, as we now picture it, there is no disorder from the fact that each one feels the whole church his own; the result is rather otherwise, for all, in consequence of this feeling, assemble together in the most natural manner, and scope is given for the exercise of all the courtesies of life, which are indeed so far the rule of the place, that the parochial officers watch with zealous eye any rude infringers of them. When the whole parish in one place meet together for common worship, the natural law is for individuals to be sorted together into classes, young men and young women together, old men and old women the same, while

mothers naturally take charge of their little daughters and fathers of their boys, unless schools absorb the children under a peculiar charge. This natural sorting into the classes which life itself points out, is more obvious among the poor than, according to present manners, among the rich; but as the former are the majority, we may surely take their manners as the standard; and where a great advantage is seen to result from them, it is a graceful concession on the part of others to adopt the same practice for the sake of uniformity, though absolute sameness and imperative uniformity on a minor point is not essential even to establish the principle as a general rule. Let it then be a matter of courtesy to place the aged near the clergyman, and to suffer all others to dispose themselves in a free and natural order, curtailing any extravagance on the part of individuals by that authority which the general sense and wisdom of the Church commit to its officers. A regular division of the sexes will naturally follow, as the legitimate mode of authoritatively settling the most natural arrangement of the congregation, as far as the more set and public services of religion are concerned, when all the parish is supposed to be present. To keep this division up at all other times would often be needlessly rigid, and tend to preserve an unwillingness which is often seen to use a part of the church, as, for instance, an aisle or transept, for minor services. In our churches, indeed, where there is but one altar, and that in the chancel, it seems hardly wise to suggest that services should be conducted in the aisles, or smaller parts of the church; for as this one chancel is the natural position of the Clergy in the performance of their offices, it follows that the congregation will always prefer being in front of it, *i. e.* in the nave, if there is room for them. Still there may be catechising of the young, or instruction to the old; in which it would be difficult to adhere to the common places allotted to the sexes, though the same general rule might be adopted, making use, for the time being, of whatever the place might be, to carry out on a small scale what the whole church was on a large one, as we observed to be done in S. Mary Magdalene, where the aisle is for both sexes, north and south of the passage, in the same way as the body.

What we have described as the parochial family assembling together for common prayer and the principal offices of religion, is the Elizabethan type of the Church. Every member of the parish was supposed to be there, on pain of being mulcted to the amount of a shilling. Now where the parish is small, and all are really bound together like a family by mutual compacts of daily life; and also where there is only one clergyman, and he, perhaps, in charge of more churches than one, from the poverty

of means, and therefore compelled to appoint his time, and then and there to go through a combination of services; under these circumstances, this theory seems all that can be aimed at; barring the fine, each parishioner must be expected to come to his church at these services, and then, of course, from the sameness of the congregation on every occasion of public worship, each one will have, as it were, his stall, like the members of a corporate body, where he will go as naturally as he occupies his own house when at home, for there will never be any reason for going to a different place.

This theory, however, though exceedingly good as far as it goes, and where it is applicable, yet is obviously not all our Church contemplates, and much of her practical stiffness seems to arise from forcing this one idea down all parishes, with no correction of its evils and deficiencies, even where circumstances do not in the least render them necessary; and still worse, with no allowance for other circumstances, which do not allow its beauties really to develop. The evils and deficiencies we refer to this theory are the paucity of the services, chiefly confined to the Sunday 'combination,' arising from the few Clergy. Where, however, there are more Clergy, who can with perfect convenience have frequent services, it seems an unnecessary hindrance to have a system which implies few services for the whole parish to be present at; which, in fact, does not recognise the utility of service unless the whole surrounding population are supposed to be then and there assembled. The Church has frequent offices, and daily prayers morning and evening, but she does not imagine that all can go on each occasion: yet pews seem to act on this supposition: once however imagine different congregations, it obviously follows that if they place themselves naturally, for whatever service they are present at, their places will not always be the same, but will vary according to many accidental circumstances. The hindrances, again, which militate against the development of the more rural picture we have described, are the result of the fact, that in a district of 10,000 it is impossible to have a place for each individual, whether present or absent, and therefore that there must be a system which allows of the most easy arrangement of those present, without waste of room in allowing for those that are absent. The appropriation system of reserved seats is, therefore, in such a place, directly to the injury of all who have not the same privilege; for, to whatever extent it is carried, so far is a portion of the church abstracted from what undoubtedly is the plan most adapted to the general good. Frequent services, for each of which the whole church is free and open, will thus make the same building far more available to a large population,

than the rigid idea represented by our present manner of conducting public worship; and open seats are necessary to foster such a plan, for otherwise our frequent services will not have the change of congregation they are designed for. The many plans for what is called 'dividing the service,' do not come within the province of our present subject, further than the general recommendation we have already expressed; but we wish to commend what seems to us a simple and easy method for commencing an improved system in this respect; and it gave us great pleasure the other day to observe that, in the arrangements announced for the chapel of St. Peter, Pimlico, our ideas were to some extent carried out. In the first place, it is desirable not altogether to throw out the fixed habits of churchgoers by disarranging everything, though, with a view to counteract acknowledged evils, it is perfectly fair to ask of them some moderate concessions. Now early services on Sunday are independent of the habits thus to be considered, and therefore may be commenced with perfect safety. There must be many in London, who, on that their only holyday, might wish to combine their presence at the services of the Church with the relaxation of a little country air. These might attend the early or late services, and still have a long day; whereas at present churchgoing is the day's work, and nothing else can be done. Suppose then early morning prayer at half-past seven, to suit purposes of this kind; and early communion, a short quiet service at half-past eight, adapted for invalids and frequent communicants generally, as well as for those just mentioned; in this case a great number will have gone through their devotions, — will, as it were, have made their use of the church before the larger congregation assembled, leaving also a sufficient interval for weddings and other like offices. The point, however, we are chiefly commending is that of leaving the present order of our services, that is, the Morning Prayer, Litany, and Communion Office, with Sermon, so far the same, that persons may, if they wish, remain through them all; but to make such a distinct break that persons may go out or come in. For this purpose there should be a definite time arranged for the commencement of each, and the bell should sound as the immediate signal of the change in the service within the church. Morning Prayer may be announced for half-past 10, Litany for 11, Communion Service for half-past 11. Any interval may well be occupied either by private contemplation or in hymns. The afternoon and evening may be employed in a succession of catechisings, baptisms, &c., and sermons, making each of such ministrations available, as much as possibly, singly by itself, and the appointed ritual of Evening Prayer either once or twice. Private use of

churches is thus seen to follow from the free system we have been tracing through its various stages; and it is this general freedom of churches, both for public and private devotion, which we feel sure is the only way of making the same building serve for a large population, and adapt itself to the various classes of age, sex, and position, which make up its numbers.

We have now but a very few words to say, and we have done. If the Church feels any practical difficulties, she naturally looks to her constituted authorities for help in reforming them. On many points it is said that Bishops and Archdeacons can do nothing, if they would; but with the pew system it is not so. The Bishop is the origin of the Churchwardens' power, as well as the ecclesiastical ruler of the Clergy. Surely, then, they may do much in teaching and encouraging Churchwardens to do their duty. Let them point out some plain rules by which they should act, and give them the whole weight of their personal and official authority in carrying them out. It is not to be expected that, in the face of complicated rights, an unassisted Churchwarden can do much, unless of peculiar energy and power; but supported by the Bishop, how quickly would many defenders of selfish claims disappear, and how easy, in comparison, would be the work in each parish, of restoration to a better system! Let Bishops and Archdeacons suggest and urge the correction of pew abuses; let them make all inquiries they can previous to visitation, and enlarge on the subject in their Charges; let them not flinch from fears of unpopularity with the middle classes, for it is their peculiar province to face any prevalent evil, with regard to the Church, from whatever class it comes. Their high position enables them, with peculiar force, to overwhelm vain and grasping claims, to confront absurd or ill-founded prejudices.

ART. IV.—*The Record Newspaper.*—*Report of the Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, May 5.*

WE shall ask our readers to give their attention for a short time to a very remarkable violation of a very common rule of morals. We do not view it with surprise; that is not our feeling; but only as a complete and exact instance of such a violation. A philosopher would regard it with admiration as a specimen. We cannot afford to be so indifferent, but must, in accordance with Christian feeling, express our sorrow that any one who stands before the public as a champion of religious interests, the improver of public morals, and the promoter of benevolent and useful schemes, should be the guilty person in the case. The rule we mean is that which is expressed in the third and fourth verses of the seventh chapter of S. Matthew's Gospel—
 'Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye,
 'and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how
 'wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of
 'thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye?'

On the 5th of May last, Lord Shaftesbury presided at a Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in Exeter Hall, and made a speech from which we extract the following passage:—

'There could be no doubt that in the present day infidelity was assuming a speciousness of form and a cunning of action that had scarcely ever been known in antecedent periods in this or any other country. It rarely happened now, in comparison with former times, that infidelity was propounded, either in speaking or writing, in the same language of coarseness and obscenity, or the same repulsive and disgusting form, as of old. It was now insinuated in a far more dexterous manner. Doubts were very cleverly dropped, and left to fester and rankle in the minds of the hearer. Every kind of sleight-of-hand, every species of adroitness was resorted to, and hundreds and thousands were entrapped by these arts, and became victims of this specious, vile, and diabolical system. In addition to that, they were beset by another danger, by that foul enemy which he would not scruple to name—Tractarianism. Of all the "isms" that ever existed, that was in his mind the most offensive, and, in many respects, the most deceitful and hypocritical. It was singular to remark the tenderness with which Infidelity looked upon Tractarianism, and the tenderness with which Tractarianism looked upon Infidelity; and how they had a common feeling, and a bond of union when set in opposition to Evangelical sentiments, which they looked upon as the great bane of society—the great pest of the present day—simply and solely because it was the only thing that stood in irreconcilable antagonism to that detestable union. No wonder, then, that they exchanged compliments—no wonder, then, that, although they might be careful not to speak in direct approbation of each other, yet, reversing

what was said in the Scripture, "He that is not with me is against me," it might be fairly said of these things, "He that is not against Infidelity and against Tractarianism is decidedly with it."—*The Record*, May 6.

Now, first, with respect to the charge which Lord Shaftesbury brings against—we will for brevity's sake borrow his term—the 'Tractarian' School. It may be quite true that writers of that school have exercised great mildness and forbearance in particular cases of scepticism, where they thought that circumstances warranted and called for such treatment. They have felt for the difficulties and temptations which beset particular minds, and they have seen in the great commotion of thought which characterises the age of the world in which we live, a general predisposing cause to a sceptical temper, which ought to be taken into account in judging individuals. In particular cases, they may even have sympathised with a zeal and enthusiasm of which they lamented the misdirection, and with a devotion to the cause of truth, as the individual supposed it, fatally as he erred in so supposing. It may suit the oratory of the platform to pass a rough and indiscriminating censure upon all opponents; but those who, in the process of forming judgment, bow to an inward sense and conscience, and not to an audience, and who express their opinion according as they themselves after consideration believe, and not according as a roomful of people can without any consideration understand, must act differently. They must make allowance where allowance is to be made, and they must acknowledge and appreciate the good, whatever it may be, that mixes with the evil. Christian charity and Christian policy alike dictate such a course. No one pays attention to another whom he sees not to understand him, not to appreciate his difficulties, or enter into his case: and the coarse judgment is received with a smile by an arrogant antagonist, with disgust by a sincere and zealous one, but with respect by neither. A long career of platform services, however useful and public spirited some may have been, leaves one disadvantageous result behind them, of which, unfair as it may appear, their liberal donor is the victim. His mind becomes too much accustomed to one particular mode of passing judgment, viz. the wholesale one. He thinks no agreement or disagreement real which is not vehement and unqualified, not to say irate. He brings the habits of the platform into his study, and judges books that thoughtful men have written, by that standard. A writer is set down as a crafty traitor, and at heart an infidel. For what reason? He has been guilty of the unpardonable offence of being cool. A distinction here, an admission there, are quite enough to stamp him as a person who is not sincere or hearty on the side on which he professes to write. Lord Shaftesbury may

have dipped here and there into 'Tractarian' books, or pamphlets, or reviews, when some sceptical work may have been under comment. He may have seen some sympathy expressed with the sincerity of the author, some pity for his temptations, some appreciation of his talents: and he has, in consequence, immediately set down the writer as not a real disapprover of sceptics; he has inferred some fundamental sympathy between scepticism and 'Tractarianism.' We need not say how controversy would lose by such a standard. Active, and earnest, and deep thinkers on all sides will respect each other *for* that earnest, active, and deep thought, and so far as it is concerned: it is only those who do not think at all that have no respect at all for thought. Even Lord Shaftesbury must in his calmer moments allow that the deepest disagreement may go along with such sympathy, and may be all the better expressed for it. It would be, indeed, a lamentable conclusion to arrive at, that the only test of sincere opposition was virulence, and the true expression of disapprobation, abuse.

So much for one-half of Lord Shaftesbury's charge, viz. 'the tenderness with which Tractarianism looks upon Infidelity.' Into the other half we do not feel ourselves called upon to enter. For 'the tenderness with which Infidelity looks upon Tractarianism,' let Infidels themselves answer; we have nothing to do with their looks, whether they are tender or whether they are severe. We cannot control their opinions either about ourselves or about others. And if it is replied that a favourable opinion from such a quarter is a bad sign, still it is to be proved to what part of the 'Tractarian' it applies, to his creed or to his conduct. We have never heard yet of an infidel who entertained a favourable opinion of the 'Tractarian' creed; he must therefore have been thinking of his conduct, if he entertained such an opinion. But an infidel, if he is only an honest man, may be a fair and competent judge of conduct; that is, he may see that one side is overbearing and abusive, and that another is patient and calm, and he may sympathise with an ill-used party as against those who ill-use them. But, lastly—for there remains another question not wholly irrelevant—do infidels look tenderly upon 'Tractarians?' Lord Shaftesbury brings no evidence, and till he brings some, we shall beg leave to doubt a fact which he has so boldly stated.

But what is the position which Lord Shaftesbury himself occupies, when he brings this charge against the 'Tractarians,' of an alliance with scepticism? In what company is he himself when he makes it? That, and not the charge itself—about which, on its own account, we should not have troubled

ourselves to speak—is the point to which we call attention. There is that specimen of moral blindness and obliquity, of a man accusing others and doing the very same thing himself, which we have thought so curious, so valuable, and so instructive, as to deserve a distinct notice in this Review.

He brings this charge while he himself is acting publicly in company and concert with a very distinguished and accomplished sceptic; acting with him not for any object of secular utility for which men of all religious sentiments may without reproach combine, but for a strictly religious object—the spread of religious truth, the dissemination of the Bible. It is, while receiving such a sceptic for a religious ally, acknowledging him as a brother, putting him forward as a supporter and patron of a religious cause,—it is with the Chevalier Bunsen on his right hand, on the platform of the Bible Society, that he brings this charge.

In attaching this epithet to the Chevalier Bunsen, we do not mean to pronounce any personal censure upon him. He may simply have imbibed the tone of society in which he has been brought up on such subjects. He may even have—and we give him credit for it—a sincere desire to raise the tone of German society on such subjects. His wish, however qualified, for an alliance between the English and German communions through the medium of the episcopacy, may have had that motive. In calling him a sceptic, we only mean to say that his opinions on the subject of the inspiration of Scripture, stated to any ordinary Churchman or even dissenter in this country, would be considered sceptical opinions. He takes a licence in his treatment of the Bible, from which Christian society in this country would shrink as fatal to the *bond fide* reception of that book as an inspired one, the word of God; considering that, with respect to historical facts, even those most intimately connected with the scheme of man's redemption, it may be in error, and that its information is not to be depended on. That he may reconcile such want of inspiration in the matter of history, with a certain inspired substance or central truth contained in it, in his own mind, we can easily believe; but we say, nevertheless, that such a want of inspiration as he attributes to Scripture in the field of history, would be considered a sceptical conclusion by ordinary religious society in this country. We will give, by way of illustration, two instances, one a less and the other a more important one—if on so serious a subject we can admit degrees of importance—of his method of treating scripture history.

It is stated in Exodus xii. 40, that 'the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and

'thirty years.' And in Genesis xv. 13, a prophecy is stated to have been made, during the lifetime of Abraham, and to that patriarch, announcing that period as the time that such sojourn would last, the only difference being that in the prophecy the round number of four centuries is given, in the historical relation, the specific number of four hundred and thirty years. Now this period of four hundred and thirty years does not suit the Chevalier Bunsen's chronological system, as gathered by him from the Egyptian hieroglyphics. Accordingly, he treats it as a mistake of the inspired writer. In the absence of eminent names during the sojourn in Egypt, and consequently of a genealogical basis on which to determine the length of this sojourn, the inspired writer is supposed to have adopted the summary method of doubling the patriarchal period. The patriarchal period, including the lives of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was 215 years: the historian knew that the period of the sojourn in Egypt was longer than that, but he did not know how much longer. As a convenient mode, therefore, of settling the point, he supposed it to be twice as long; that is to say, 430 years. Such is the treatment of the sacred narrative; that of the prophecy corresponds. The prophecy is supposed to have been made 'somewhat earlier or later, for this is doubtful,' than the event to which it related, viz. the termination of the sojourn in Egypt.¹ That is to say, the statement which the Bible says was prophetic, the Chevalier Bunsen says was not.

The other instance of the Chevalier Bunsen's treatment of the historical Scriptures is a more important one, involving, as it does, a whole set of facts, intimately connected with the scheme of man's redemption, its promise, its type, the family selected as the instrument of its fulfilment, and appealed to constantly throughout the New Testament, with such reference. The sacrifice of Isaac was the significant type of that higher sacrifice which God the Father made in sending His only Son into the world to suffer death upon the cross for man's redemption. The Messiah is declared throughout Scripture to be the veritable seed of Abraham. The relation, then, in which the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob stand to one another and to the Jewish nation, is an important fact in Scripture history. Nevertheless, the Chevalier Bunsen destroys it, coming, as it does, into collision with his chronological system. To Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob he allows a personal existence, but without a family relationship. 'The genealogy of the chosen friend of God is historically to be looked upon as exhibiting great and long-enduring commotions of the old population of Asia; it

¹ Christian Remembrancer, vol. xii. p. 300.

'represents the relation of tribes to each other, not personal relations of father and son.' And the genealogy of Abraham, as M. Bunsen uses the term, includes his posterity as well as his forefathers, for he includes in it Abraham's posterity by Keturah; adding, that 'any one who still wishes not to see with regard to these names, that they are the names of tribes not of persons, will here, through the plural form of the names, be compelled to acknowledge that he is in the presence of traditions as to the connexion of tribes of people.' In the midst of this great province of names, representing tribes, he makes, indeed, an exception in favour of the three patriarchs, so far as to suppose that they were not tribes but persons; an exception of which, while we admire the spirit, we must confess an entire inability to understand the rationale. But their personality is all which is allowed; their relationship, and with it the whole affecting narrative of facts supposing it, as well as their bearing upon the scheme of the gospel, falls to the ground. Indeed it has been observed, that of the whole history of Abraham, upon M. Bunsen's plan, only one chapter is retained as true, viz. that in which he fights with four kings of Canaan for the delivery of Lot. And by a strange coincidence, that remarkable German critic, M. Ewald, selects the same chapter for unqualified approval, as 'an account of inestimable value;' the value apparently lying mainly in the circumstance that it is considered 'wholly at variance with all other accounts.' Thus Abraham 'appears like Eshkol and Mamre, with whom he stands in a mutual defensive alliance, as the head of a mighty house of Canaan—he wages war, an act not even distantly hinted at in the older Mosaic documents, as not being suitable to a prophet and holy man in the Mosaic view.'

But M. Bunsen's responsibility extends beyond his own particular written opinions and conclusions. We do not say that for a man to praise those who go all lengths on any question, is exactly the same thing as going those lengths himself. But we do say that it is a very grave additional responsibility which he undertakes. And when such praise is given with warmth and earnestness, when it is applied not to any general talents or endowments of mind which the other may show, but to his services on the particular subject, it is difficult to believe that the commender can object heartily even to the very lengths to which the other carries his speculation, and that he does not agree fundamentally with him. We have just mentioned a remarkable German theological critic, M. Ewald, the author of a book called a 'History of the People of Israel.' Of the principles on which M. Ewald deals with Scripture, his general view of inspiration, we may form some idea when we

learn that he has adopted it as an axiom that 'a passage seemingly containing prophecy' is of the date of the event of 'which it speaks.' Thus the authors of the prophecy of Jacob, of the prophecy of Moses, and of the prophecy of Balaam, are placed respectively in the time of the Judges, in the reign of Josiah, and in the reign of Uzziah or Jotham. These writers are called 'prophetic relators of history,' and their predictions are considered to belong to a peculiar style of authorship. On a similar principle of criticism the author of the book of Deuteronomy is placed very late, viz. 'in the second half of the reign of king Manasseh,' the reason for the assignment of so late a date being that the book of Deuteronomy itself states that it was written by Moses' own hand. M. Ewald sees in such an assertion 'a boldness of historical assumption' which only belongs to the later ages of history. 'Such an assumption,' he remarks, 'is certainly one of the many signs of the later date of this writer, who, on the very ground that he felt himself to be at such a distance from the time of Moses, gave the freest play to the mode of looking upon and treating history.' Such a mode of treating history is indeed a very free one, being no less than the assertion that something took place which never did.

It can be no wonder if on such principles of criticism the whole of the early Bible history melts into mist and darkness; if the prevailing character of the Bible relations is declared to be unhistorical; if the patriarchs are supposed to stand at the head of a series of ideal pictures, analogous to the heroes as distinct from the gods of heathen antiquity; the juxtaposition of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob being compared to the triad of Agamemnon Achilles and Ulysses, on which the *Iliad*, and that of Anchises Æneas and Ascanius, on which the old tale of Troy, the basis of the *Æneid*, turns. Nor can it be any matter of surprise if from the age of heroes we ascend to that of gods, and on passing from patriarchal into antediluvian times, meet with two demigoddesses in the wives of Lamech, Ada and Zillah, with Janus, or the modern Yanacea, in the person of Enoch, with Mars in the person of Methuselah, with Apollo in that of Mahalaleel, with the river-god, or the Indian Varuna, in that of Jared. The critic does not indeed impose these analogies dictatorially upon his readers, but only as the most reasonable conjectures he can form, considering the great difficulties under which his inquiry is conducted. 'Our inquiry,' he says, 'into this period is rendered the more difficult, because 'with very slight exceptions our only source is the Bible.' Abandoned, however, to so poor (as he imagines) an authority or guide, he has made the most of his resources; for no sagacity less than that of an acute German critic could, by the light of

Scripture principally, have discovered such remarkable analogies. Moreover he considers that however obscure the source, some truths, even of an historical kind, may be drawn from Scripture. 'Although,' says M. Ewald, 'we cannot here own very much so securely as we could wish, as pure history, yet at least some strictly historical truths of importance do come up, the more welcome out of that distant sea of fog, so soon as we are adequately qualified to see them right.'¹

After settling who the patriarchs themselves were, M. Ewald settles their religion; which was, according to him, polytheistic in its bias. It had, indeed, a monotheistic element, which 'Mosaism' afterwards took up and developed, but the element was then but a partial one. The monotheism of the patriarchs was a local and a domestic monotheism; there was no more than one god for one place, or for one family; but another place and another family might have another god. The god of the three patriarchs was one god in relation 'to their rule, which was simply domestic,' he was 'essentially a single family-god.' He 'was conceived of indeed with strict morality, and in contrast with any degraded conceptions.' But 'such a domestic god, however elevated were the conceptions of him, admitted of other gods together with himself, for other houses or other men, and accordingly was in no way a security against polytheism.' Indeed 'that God in the time before Moses was conceived of with this idea of indefinite extension and possible divisibility, the standing use of the plural *elohim* proves (especially as compared with the corresponding *teraphim*, *penates*). The oldest tale itself proves this, in that in an oath it makes Jacob and Laban call upon the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor as two different gods.' The two altars built respectively to the 'God of Bethel,' and 'God, the God of Israel,' prove the same. Thus 'together with the chief god, the house-god of the chief, a hero-pantheon was formed;' and 'there was wanting to the One God of the patriarchs all the more precise definiteness and sharp severance of the Mosaic God.'²

Such is the critic of whose labours the Chevalier Bunsen thus speaks:—'The first part of Ewald's History of the People of Israel has appeared; a work which we look upon as the beginning of a truly historical corrected research into this ever-memorable portion of the history and its sources, and hail with glowing thankfulness as an honourable memorial of German learning and historical science.' 'Oh for the earnest and sifting eye of Ewald!'

So much for the opinions of M. Bunsen himself, and the

¹ Christian Remembrancer, vol. xii. p. 311.

² Ibid. p. 415.

opinions of those whom he admires. We may add, on the authority of a correspondent in the *Record*, that these opinions of his have already excluded him from the platform of two societies, of whose impartial estimate of him, and strong reluctance to take such a step, nobody can doubt—the London Missionary Society, and the Religious Tract Society.

Can Lord Shaftesbury then show cause why the rebuke which we quoted from the Gospel of S. Matthew should not be addressed to him—‘Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?’ If Lord Shaftesbury has not placed himself within the legitimate compass of that rebuke, no one ever has, and no one ever will do so. With a writer who openly knocks down the inspiration of Scripture whenever it suits his own theories, with a most distinguished sceptic, by his side, he dares to accuse another party of an alliance with scepticism. It is not we, but the very letter of Scripture which rebukes him, and which proceeds to rebuke him further, and to combine with its rebuke advice:—‘Thou hypocrite! first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye.’

But we have not yet done. The ‘Tractarian party,’ which Lord Shaftesbury accuses of an alliance with scepticism, has one eminent member, who is so far, to the popular eye, in the position of a leader, that his name has been given to it. Now it so happens, that just six years ago an elaborate letter appeared in this very Review, with the initials of that eminent person appended to it, warning the religious world of the opinions of M. Bunsen, their contradiction to the Inspiration of Scripture, and so to the very foundation of Christian belief. We have referred to it throughout this article. That letter must have caused no small pain to its writer, for, if we mistake not, it was written at the cost of many private friendly recollections of the distinguished person whom he thought it a public religious duty to oppose. It was a letter marked with all the care and earnestness for which its writer is so remarkable, with all his fulness of proof, reference, and quotation. The work of M. Bunsen, ‘Egypt’s Position in the History of the World,’ which had then recently become known in this country, was regularly entered into, examined and laid bare; all that portion of it, that is, which related to the Bible history, and its inspiration. Society was solemnly warned against audacious speculation upon sacred ground, against all tampering with the Bible, against the inroads of Scepticism and Infidelity. So far, then, as that writer represents ‘Tractarians,’ and we may add, so far as

this Review, in which his letter appeared, represents them, 'Tractarians,' so far from allying themselves with Infidelity, have, on the contrary, been the very first to oppose it; the first to discover it when it came under specious disguises, and under the authority of an eminent name, which might have blinded the ignorant and careless. So far from entrapping others, on the contrary, they first warned others of the snare; warned them when they did not see it, and might in consequence have fallen into it. We leave it to the impartial bystander to determine which is the ally of the sceptic, he who discovers and convicts him, or he who, after he has been discovered and convicted, openly unites with and hails him upon a religious ground as a brother; the 'Tractarian,' or Lord Shaftesbury.

The rebuke, then, which was just now addressed to Lord Shaftesbury, was, indeed, a too indulgent one; it assumed a higher state of morals in the offender, than we can admit in his Lordship. For the rebuke supposes that the offender, in speaking ill of his neighbour, speaks the truth about him, only that he is a hypocrite to speak it, when he himself is just as bad, and should therefore hold his tongue. But Lord Shaftesbury has not yet learned those rudiments of morals which the Gospel text supposes even in the hypocrite. He comes under the Jewish law, before the Gospel has a word to say to him—an offender against the ninth commandment of the Decalogue, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness.' When the Jewish law has rebuked him as a calumniator, and he has mended that fault, he has a title to be brought under the Gospel count of hypocrisy; but as yet he is not sufficiently advanced for it. A man is fit for reproof on a higher and more refined ground, when he has profited by reproof on a lower and simpler one, but not till then. It would be wasted on him; it would be casting pearls before swine. When Lord Shaftesbury has learned the simple duty of speaking the truth, he will be ripe for instruction in the deeper one of knowing when he has the right to speak it. He may unlearn hypocrisy when he has ceased to be a slanderer. But he is not likely to unlearn it before. Meantime, we shall watch any amendment which we may discern from time to time in him, with that satisfaction which we ought to feel when a man, who has been a long time employed, and most honourably and usefully, in improving society, begins at last to think of improving himself. We shall rejoice to see, of the two characters which he at present owns by accumulation, even one dropped, and still more, if that release prepares for the other; as, indeed, it will probably do. Veracity about others will lead in return to knowledge of himself. And when Lord Shaftesbury speaks the truth of others,

and knows himself and his own position, he will not accuse the 'Tractarians' of an alliance with scepticism, and certainly will not do so in company with the Chevalier Bunsen.

Whilst we were at press, indeed when most of the foregoing sheets were worked off, Dr. Pusey's important 'Letter to Lord Shaftesbury' appears in the *Morning Chronicle* of June 26. Dr. Pusey, as our whole argument has urged, is not only specially aggrieved by this slander of Lord Shaftesbury, but has shown, on an occasion when Revelation was particularly assailed, and that by his own friend, that on him that slander falls with the least effect. For either reason his remonstrance is most important. He, at any rate, has a peculiar right to speak. Whether Lord Shaftesbury, after disregarding private warnings of so touching a character as Dr. Pusey alludes to, will still retain his supercilious disregard of truth and decency, remains to be seen. To complete the case, however, as far as it has at present gone, we reprint Dr. Pusey's letter from the *Morning Chronicle*:—

'My dear Lord Shaftesbury—In writing to you publicly, on account of a statement which you made some time past, as to "the tenderness with which Tractarians look upon infidelity," and "the organs of infidelity upon Tractarianism," let me, in the first place, assure you that I would not speak or think one word or thought unkindly towards yourself. I have looked with interest upon all your exertions in behalf of the poor, whether in Parliament, or through private institutions. Every Christian must be thankful for whatever is done, directly or indirectly, to raise any of our degraded poor, or bring them to the knowledge of our Redeemer.

'Nor do I ask for any personal explanation as to myself. Your charge was quite general. It alluded specially to no one, but, on that very account, it included all. It was reported thus:—"They [Christians, now] were beset by another danger—by that foul enemy which he would not scruple to name—Tractarianism. Of all the 'isms' that ever existed, that was in his mind the most offensive, and in many respects the most deceitful and hypocritical. It was singular to remark the tenderness with which infidelity looked upon Tractarianism, and the tenderness with which Tractarianism looked upon infidelity; and how they had a common feeling, and a bond of union, when set in opposition to Evangelical sentiments, which they looked upon as the great bane of society—the great pest of the present day—simply and solely because it was the only thing that stood in irreconcilable antagonism to that detestable union. No wonder, then, that they exchanged compliments," &c.

'I did not believe, until you yourself informed me that these words were substantially correct, that any human being could have brought such a

charge as this. Accustomed as my friends have been for nearly twenty years to all sorts of misconception and misrepresentation, I never met with anything like this. I know not whether you used the word Tractarian in the narrower sense of those who wrote the "Tracts for the Times," a publication closed about eleven years ago, or in the larger sense of those who, in main principles, agree with them. In either case, I know that (although unconsciously, of course, to yourself) *your lordship's statement is absolutely and entirely untrue*. If you took the word Tractarian in its narrowest sense, it might be enough to remind you who are the chief surviving writers of the "Tracts for the Times," with one only exception, who has been lost to the Church of England. And of the remaining writers, not of him, you must have been speaking, since you were speaking of the Church of England. The chief remaining contributors, then, are the two Mr. Kebles, Mr. Isaac Williams, and myself. I would appeal to yourself, my dear lord, to find one sentence in any of our writings during this whole period which should give you the slightest plea for any such statement as this. If you took the word Tractarian in the wider sense, you must necessarily include in it some of the most valued and thoughtful defenders of our common faith, whose names I will not unite with such a name of reproach as Tractarians.

'Your lordship's statement is threefold: 1. (to drop the abstract term, since Tractarianism can have no existence independent of its writers,) that "Tractarians look with tenderness upon infidelity;" and this, 2. out of "opposition to Evangelicalism;" and this not in itself, but, 3. "because it is the only irreconcilable antagonist to the union" between Tractarianism and infidelity.

'1. I have already written to you in private that "I cannot even imagine what plea you can have for this dreadful charge." Tenderness for individuals, who are unhappily perplexed about their faith, or have lost it, all must have who believe that our Lord died for all, and that even these may be won back to Him. But your charge is, that "Tractarianism looks with tenderness," not upon infidels, but "upon infidelity." I can conceive, as I have said to you, that persons might say that infidelity might come as a reaction from "the Catholic faith," *i. e.* that persons who would not receive it, would, if not allowed any compromise, adopt infidelity in preference. I can understand its being said that people "drive others to infidelity" (as they speak) by the claims which "the Catholic faith" makes upon human reason. But I cannot understand how any writers, teaching (*as the writers of the Tracts did*) that Holy Scripture is implicitly to be believed—that it is the source of all faith and truth; that it is to be understood in the sense in which it was always understood by the Church from the time of the Apostles; that the human mind is implicitly to submit to authority—can be supposed to have any leanings towards infidelity. The first principle on the one side is the submission, or, as Archbishop Howley said, "the prostration of the human understanding" before the revealed will of God; that of the other, of course, its uncontrolled sway.

' 2. Your second charge is, that this tenderness to infidelity arises, in fact, out of a blind hatred to Evangelicalism as "the great bane of society, the great pest of the present day." I need only appeal to any of the writings of the persons whom I have named, or to their personal history, to show this to be untrue. I know it to have been the uniform desire of those writers, and of every other whom I know, who would be entitled a Tractarian, (as it has been my own,) to point out, both in public and in private, what we have in common with Evangelicalism—to seek out (where we were permitted) those called Evangelicals—to confer with them, remove prejudice and misunderstanding when we could, to seize on every point of approximation, to recognise, in their teaching, all which we believed to be true. We have wished, not so much to oppose Evangelicalism, as to supply its defects. All its positive teaching almost is ours too. We have looked upon it as a maimed exhibition of the Gospel, teaching nakedly certain truths, and leaving others out of sight. We have wished to teach all the fundamental truths which it, too, teaches, and to supply what was wanting to it. I know, too, that to a very great extent, this our endeavour has been blessed. Prejudices have disappeared, misunderstandings have been cleared, when people ventured to become acquainted either with Tractarians, or with their writings. I believe that, in proportion as we love one another, we shall understand one another. For the glow of love draws up those mists which hinder people from seeing each other, or the truth clearly, and mostly refract and distort the form of both.

' 3. It is more shocking than the rest to have to deny the last charge, that the ground of opposition to "Evangelical sentiments" is, that they are antagonistic to the union of Tractarianism with infidelity. I believe that the "opposition" has, for the most part, been that of defence—explanation against attacks. But, in as far as any of us have written controversially, it has not been—God forbid!—against any of the blessed truths which enter into the Evangelical system, but against its denials, direct or indirect, of other truths of the Gospel.

' I agree with you, and have felt these twenty-seven years (ever since I became acquainted with German), that the faith in England would have to go through a fiery trial in conflict with infidelity. It was impressed upon me in the study of the history of rationalism then, that neither a dry orthodoxy, nor Evangelicalism, could stand against it. Pietism began as fervently as the early Evangelicalism. Some of its early members were learned. But in the next generation it degenerated, for the most part, and was swept away by the flood of infidelity. I believe that none of my friends have failed to be alive to this evil of rationalism; and part of the offence which we have given has been that we discerned rationalism in the minds and systems of Zwingli and Calvin. We may not have used armour which you wished, or may have used arms which you, on your side, would mistrust. It is true that I did once decline your wish that I should write against a work which was attracting some notice, and which we both believed to be

mischievous. I forget upon what ground. I imagine that I had more immediate and pressing personal duties. For we have to learn in life that we cannot, intellectually also, do what we would: life passes away, while things which we would do even for the glory of God remain undone. Or I may have thought that anything which I could do in that direction, I could, with God's help, do much better by teaching truth positively than by writing against another's book. I asked you to apply to your "friends the Evangelicals," not as thinking that the task especially belonged to them, but wishing that they would bear part of the burden and heat of the day, instead of wasting our time and strength by their controversies against us, and misrepresentations of our faith.

'I wrote most of this privately to you more than a month ago, and I expressed "my hope that your statements may have been much misrepresented," and my conviction that, if it was so, "you would wish publicly to correct it." You think this unreasonable. I have asked you again to think whether it is "unreasonable, when an unfounded and heavy charge of indifference to Christianity itself, in a blind hatred against a popular system of it, is brought against a body of fellow-Christians, more or fewer, and those bound by our holy calling, as well as by our common faith, to maintain and teach the blessed Gospel"—is it unreasonable in one of those accused to ask you publicly to correct the statement?

' "In another" (I have written to you privately) "one might have passed it by as a shocking calumny. But when one who, like yourself, stands forward as the advocate of religious truth, makes such a statement, it may take its place among the popular impressions of the day. The gainer, I believe, by all these unseemly imputations, is not the cause you would wish to see prosper, but that very infidelity. For if we were such as you represent us, we should have been half infidels ourselves. And nothing outwardly so disposes to unbelief as the impression that those who profess to be Christians do not believe, or are indifferent to, what they profess."

'I do then again call upon you, not as a matter personal to myself, yet, as having some right to do so, as being included among those of whom you spoke—I call upon you, in the name of our common Christianity, of our one Lord and Redeemer, to re-consider the charge which you have made, and if you find that you were, in speaking, hurried beyond your deliberate conviction, or beyond what you had adequate grounds for saying, to unsay it as publicly as you said it. Surely you cannot persist in what you are warned (although, of course, you did not intend it) is a false accusation, contrary to every principle, feeling, desire, to the whole faith and being of those against whom you made it.

'Yours faithfully,

E. B. PUSEY.'

'*Christ Church, June 23.*'

- ART. V.—1. *Miss Sellon and the 'Sisters of Mercy.' An Exposure of the Constitution, Rules, Religious Views, and Practical Working of their Society; obtained through a Sister who has recently seceded.* By the REV. JAMES SPURRELL, A.M., Vicar of Great Shelford, Cambridgeshire. London: Hatchards.
2. *Reply to a Tract by the Rev. J. SPURRELL, containing certain Charges concerning the Society of the Sisters of Mercy of Devonport and Plymouth.* By the SUPERIOR OF THE SOCIETY. London: Masters.
3. *A Letter to Miss Sellon, Superior of the Society of Sisters of Mercy, at Plymouth.* By HENRY, Lord Bishop of Exeter. London: Murray.
4. *A Rejoinder to the Reply of the Superior of the Society of the Sisters of Mercy of Devonport and Plymouth, to a Pamphlet entitled, 'Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy:' by the Rev. James Spurrell, A.M.* By the same. London: Hatchards.
5. *A Letter to the Rev. James Spurrell, A.M.* By A MEMBER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. London: Masters.
6. *Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Misery; or, Miss Sellon in the Family.* By the Rev. W. M. COLLIS, A.B., Curate of Melton Mowbray. London: Hatchards.
7. *Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy. Further Statement of the Rules, Constitution, and Working of the Society called 'The Sisters of Mercy,' together with an exact Review of Miss Sellon's Reply.* By DIANA A. G. CAMPBELL, a Novice lately seceded. London: Hatchards.

THE reader will conjecture, from the list of books placed at our heading, what subject the next few pages will offer to his attention. Our notice of it shall be as short as possible, for more than one reason. In the first place, the acts of—if we may use the expression without offence to the Superior of the Sisterhood at Devonport—a young lady, are not usual material for the pages of a Review. We criticise the lady as authoress, when she comes out as such: we have seldom to do with her as actor. Any comment, therefore, upon her in that capacity is made at a great disadvantage. It is made at the expense of those natural feelings which, under ordinary circumstances, erect a barrier between her and the public: and the writer of the comment feels the effect of an unfavourable position, and anticipates his

reader's observation of it. There are other reasons why such a task is not an agreeable one.

We submit cheerfully, then, to a disadvantageous position. At the same time we must add, in justice to ourselves, that we could not have avoided it. What all the world talks about, a review is expected to notice. If no notice appears, the charge is made of negligence or cowardice. Whatever responsibility, therefore, there may be in bringing the acts of a zealous and noble-minded lady under public comment, belongs to the world at large, and not to ourselves. We can give no more publicity to the subject than it already possesses.

But after apologizing for commenting upon Miss Sellon's proceedings at all, we have next to apologize for the circumstance, that that comment will not be one of unmingled approval. We deeply regret this, more especially as we cannot but fear that some, for whose opinion we entertain a high respect, will consider such absence of entire and simple approval, as very misplaced in this quarter, and will make the remark, if not to others, at least to themselves, that we had better have said nothing, than said what did not amount to that.

To begin, then, with some remarks addressed to persons who have these feelings,—remarks on the general subject of criticism; for the objection they entertain falls under this general head.

A strong objection, then, is sometimes felt to criticism in one particular case, by persons who adopt a high and refined, though, perhaps, an over-tender and sensitive standard of humility. The case supposed is that in which a person of extraordinary Christian attainments and gifts, great self-denial and great spirituality of mind, is the subject of criticism. Such persons happily there are, in all ages of the world, and sometimes their schemes and labours bring them prominently before the public eye. In such cases, that is to say, where positive action is before us in the shape of objects pursued and undertakings carried on, there is necessarily room for criticism. But unhappily, the great body of those who have to form the judgment in such a case, are not of this extraordinary Christian stamp. Numbers of them may be good conscientious persons, doing their duty in that station of life in which Providence has placed them; but the many are necessarily ordinary. There is, therefore, in the present case, the ordinary Christian sitting as judge, while the extraordinary one appears before him to undergo judgment. Such a state of things, say these persons, is an anomalous and improper one; and they recommend in such a case the suspension of the operation of the critical faculty. It is not, they argue, for common Christians to be forming a judgment upon those who are infinitely their superiors in self-denial, loftiness, and spirituality

of life. They cannot comprehend their motives, or appreciate their aims. They judge them by some mixed, half Christian, half worldly, standard which they have adopted for themselves, and forget that that very standard incapacitates them for such a task. It is for such to put their minds into an attitude of respect simply. They cannot assume the critical office without offending against the first law of humility.

It must be admitted that this is, within certain limits, a very natural and just line of thought; nor is there, perhaps, any Clergyman of a parish, schoolmaster, or parent, who has not to fall back upon it as a basis of discipline, and a check to presumption and impertinence. But the absolute rule, that no inferior is ever to judge the conduct of a superior, is such an exaggeration of the natural law, as cannot, either in the department of reason or of practice, support the test of sober examination.

For let the persons who urge such a rule only consider what it involves in every judgment whatever made by one man upon another. We presume that they allow, in the first instance, that the power of forming a judgment upon man's character and conduct, was not implanted in us for no object whatever, but was intended for use. But what is the preliminary position which this rule makes essential for the performance of any act of judgment upon another, the inseparable condition of any use whatever of the faculty? It obliges him to say that he thinks himself morally and spiritually better than the person who is the subject of judgment. Now it is, in the first place, questionable, if we insist upon strict right, whether any one man has a right to say absolutely that he is better than any other: for, however reasonable a conjecture he may form, he cannot know it as a fact; and till he knows it as a fact, he had better abstain from asserting it. And in that case the present rule would act immediately as a universal prohibitor and suppressor of the act of judgment in man. But allowing for the right of formal self-preference in particular instances of comparison, in which an enormous and extreme moral disparity was apparent,—a very wide field would still be left in which the judgment would remain prohibited from exertion. For certainly no man has a right positively to assert himself to be better than another, except it is a very clear case—so clear as that there could be no disagreement about it among impartial judges of any class. Apparent difference of degree in goodness, where both belonged to the general class of good characters, even considerable difference, would be far from a sure basis for such a decision. And therefore the whole class of good men of all kinds, all well-disposed and respectable society, would be disqualified on this rule for forming any judgment upon conduct and character

within their sphere. But lastly, even could we imagine the right to exist, and to a large extent, still the exertion of it is so invidious and so opposed to delicacy, modesty, and taste, that no right-minded person can bring himself to it. A higher law than that of justice interferes to prevent him. So here is a rule, according to which the only passage to the exercise of a certain faculty is made one which no well-disposed mind can take; a rule by which an act of judgment is thrown back upon a basis of presumption, no other being equal to supporting it.

But to the inconsistency of such a rule in reason, we must add some most injurious effects in practice. First, the effect is most injurious as regards the persons themselves whom it thus lifts above all the reach of criticism. There cannot be a more dangerous temptation, even to the highest and most spiritual minds, than the offer of such an unguarded and unchecked deference—a deference which tells them that with respect to them the reason has given up its natural functions; that they have nothing to do but to follow out their own ideas as they please, and that they are sure to be right. It was never intended that man should enjoy such a position as this. There is no despotism in morals. Every one, however high be his character and rank spiritual, should be considered under the jurisdiction of the moral and religious part of the community, so far as that they may call him to account for what he does, and examine and decide upon it, whether it is right or wrong. If persons are encouraged to regard the community as beneath them, they are put in a false position; and so far as their own minds accept this position, they receive moral harm. The general sense of mankind is the proper constitutional check upon the caprices and impetuosity of the individual; and if he throws it off, he deprives himself of a providential discipline. Moreover, such an elevation of the individual is very injurious as an example. It awakens the vanity of many a religious beginner. He aspires to a position which he sees placed before him as the reward of zeal and activity, and he is no sooner an aspirant than he forestalls the goal, and enjoys all the sentiment of such a position long before he has done anything to gain it. So true is it, that where persons are not content with a virtue as nature has made it, they first spoil, and finally destroy it. The rule which we have been considering begins with an undue claim upon humility, and ends in the greatest encouragement to pride. There is first an exaggeration, and then a fall. The reason is deprived of its functions in order to deepen humility, and the result is a great snare to that very virtue, in the creation of a post too high for man,—as great a scandal and an offence as one man can put in another's path. It may be said, indeed, that

the mass are the gainers, though at the expense of those whom it elevates; for that the humility of the mass is not impaired by the arrogant use made of it by the few. But no one can seriously imagine that one party can be benefited by what is an undue scandal to the other. We are all one body, and what injures one is sooner or later injurious to the rest. If a certain form of the virtue of humility is found not to work well in the body, but to produce mischief upon strictly natural principles, then that form, we may depend upon it, is not the true and proper form of that virtue, but is an artificial form of it, invented by man, and therefore not a sound and proper humility even in those who exhibit it.

But it is of comparatively slight consequence, except to themselves, that some individuals should either in whole or in part lose the grace of humility. It is of great consequence, indeed, to all, that the moral sense of mankind should be preserved in integrity. But this rule, could we imagine it really in operation, would ultimately deprave and corrupt the moral sense of mankind. An act of judgment upon any proceeding of another is nothing but an exertion of the moral sense. Whenever an action takes place, it either agrees or disagrees with our idea of what is right. The perception of this agreement or disagreement by a person is his judgment. Whether he expresses it or not, if he definitely perceives it, he judges: the right of expression following upon the first principles of reason. This being the case, it is evident that if men cease to exert such judgment as we are speaking of, they cease to exert their moral sense. On coming across such and such phenomena of conduct which come before it, this faculty gives way and does not perform its functions: it is suppressed in deference to the same faculty in some other person. Now, remember, that in the present instance the party suppressing its moral sense is the community, the one whose sense is deferred to, the individual. The general result follows, that the moral sense of mankind at large is accommodated to that of individuals; made to coincide with the individual's in its whole scope and direction. But are individuals safe standards? Is it right to entrust to their keeping and control the moral sense of mankind? Certainly not: not even the noblest, wisest, and best are to be so far trusted. The individual's sense is partial and distorted; the body's alone is large and proportioned. The individual is soon exhausted, soon absorbed: the very attention to one duty often withdraws him from another, and in withdrawing him from it practically, lessens even his perception of it. He is entirely occupied in some limited field of labour, and thinks that the whole world; his narrowness makes him eager, his eagerness makes him

narrow. Does he set his mind on some work? All other considerations must give way. The idea of relative importance, of comparison of interests, of balance and adjustment, goes. He runs into obliquities and extravagances. All this is necessary, because the individual is the individual, and not the body,—a fractional, a small being. Commit the control and moulding then of the moral sense of mankind to individuals, and what must ensue? The moral sense of mankind will become partial and distorted. A change will take place like the great diluvial revolutions which geologists describe. Some whole tracts of duty will disappear, enormous new ones will be cast up. Some important moral rules will be forgotten entirely, others will domineer; and a capricious and artificial idea of right or wrong will supersede the natural one.

Indeed we have here the true direct answer to the rule, that no inferior in character must judge a superior. It is quite true, that no superior ought to be judged by an inferior on those points on which he is the superior, and has the better and truer perceptions of the two. But it does not follow that a person, who is superior, on the whole, in his perceptions of duty to another, is superior on every point. A person of inferior perceptions to him generally may have a superior perception, to his, of some one or other particular duty. The very possession of a more intense and earnest mind, will cause a too small estimate of some duties, as it will a too large one of others. And where an estimate is wrong, it may be corrected by another mind whose estimate is better.

There is another consideration. We have been supposing here all along that the extraordinary Christian, the one who makes some remarkable sacrifices of a tangible and distinct kind, and adopts a peculiar plan of life, *is* superior to an ordinary Christian; meaning by that term, one who mixes with the main body, and has no external peculiarity. But it is obvious, that such an assumption as this must be largely modified, if it is to be made consistent with truth. This is so old a topic, that we need only touch on it. It is obvious to any one, who is an observer of character at all, that many persons who adopt no peculiar external plan of life, are better persons than some who do. The circumstance of making distinct tangible sacrifices, is no absolute test of superiority. The Christian character may be more deeply seated in one who has not made this class of sacrifices, than in one who has. And if the body of ordinary Christians contains, as it unquestionably does, such characters as these, we ought to be careful how we depreciate the judgment of that body.

If this whole line of remark on the situation of individuals,

and their amenableness to criticism, be true, we will add, that they are not inopportune in the peculiar circumstances of the Church to which we belong. There have been always parties in the Christian Church, for there have always been differences of opinion within the Church. But our branch of the Church has been especially divided into parties, and the tone and feeling of these have of late years become more intense. We use the word 'parties,' applying it alike to both the great divisions of the English Church; not that we think both alike in point of truth, but because we are going to speak now of a property which belongs to all parties, right and wrong ones, alike. It is the nature of all parties to be adulatory. They praise their prominent and serviceable adherents, without limit or qualification. And they do this upon a principle not unreasonable or unjust. We will illustrate the case by one, not wholly similar, but somewhat analogous. Everybody knows the unqualified tone which prevails at public meetings, especially at public dinners, with regard to individuals. That a man has lived so many years in a town or county respectably, and has been an attentive magistrate, a courteous mayor, an active churchwarden, or a vigilant poor-law guardian, is sufficient to procure him a tribute of commendation which would not have disappointed the appetite of a Roman Emperor or an Eastern Caliph. Every motive which has distinguished heroes, from the earliest dawn of history, is attributed to him in perfect purity. He has been inspired with the love of his fellow-citizens, and been absorbed in their interests. For their sake he has braved the greatest dangers, and surmounted the most overwhelming difficulties. His sacrifices are supposed to be incalculable; but what is that to one to whom private interest has been always an idea unknown? Such is the warm estimate of character which speakers adopt on such occasions, and the benevolence of praise grows with its exertion, and demands fresh and fresh objects. Perfect virtue before long owns for her sons the proprietors of the chief seats in the neighbourhood, and the leading inhabitants of the borough. In due course she has made a considerable inroad on the principal streets. Now a spectator of such a scene, who only looked upon the surface, would beyond a doubt set it down as ridiculous. But—we pardon a mistake which is so easily made—it is not. Let us not treat such a subject superficially. The basis on which these demonstrations take place is this, that that is the *place* for praising people. True, it is said, all these persons may have their faults, and they may be noticed in their proper place: but this is not the *place* for noticing them. We are met *here* to commend one another. That is our object. The theory of such demonstrations thus at once confines them to

praise, to the entire omission of whatever may jar with that object. But praise which is without balance is obliged in consistency to be high. Its subject is by the hypothesis faultless, and it must equal its subject.

Now party praise proceeds upon a rationale not unlike this. Just as the public meeting is not the *place* to notice the faults of its principal attendants, so a party, if we may be allowed the expression, is not the *person* to notice errors in its eminent and conspicuous members. There may be two sides in the case, but it is only our function, says the party, to notice one. If there is anything wrong about our friends and supporters, let the opposition find it out, but it is not our especial duty to be calling attention to it. We have the duty of helping and encouraging them; so if they write anything we praise it; if they do anything, it is correct in our eyes. There is some reason in this ground. Parties are collections of persons who agree in certain main objects, which they wish to forward. To forward such objects it is necessary to encourage individual activity and zeal. But encouragement implies a hearty and warm tone in the encouraging tongue and pen. The criticizer is in the position, at the outset, of a friend. He is preengaged on the favourable side, as friends and relations are to one another. It would be out of place for him to be 'damning with faint praise' and studious balance every effort that zeal on his own side made.

But while the ground which a party takes on this subject is not itself unreasonable, it is to be feared it has its disadvantageous effects; and that such a position, however necessary for it, and on the whole working well, is procured at some expense. It is quite true that really sensible minds will understand this position, and will value the praise they get accordingly. They will know that it is praise upon an hypothesis of partiality. They will take such a proper business-like view of it, as results from perceiving the natural laws of party action, and the original exigencies of party which create those laws. But, unfortunately, it is not every clever, or every zealous, or every sincere mind, that is sensible. Moreover, it is not every one who is sensible with regard to others, who is sensible with regard to himself. It is to be feared that unqualified praise does operate disadvantageously upon some, who receive the tribute, and forget the understanding on which it is paid; are satisfied with the effect, and make no curious inquiries into the cause and foundation. There are many excellent persons who are tolerably indifferent as to what is underneath, in such a case, provided there is merit in the superstructure. To such the liberal offerings of party sympathy are somewhat of a snare, too

soothing to the spirits, too grateful to the sense; they domesticate certain infirmities of the character, and drag upon the ascent in the path of Christian humility.

We may observe, by the way, that this *rationale* of party praise accounts for a fact which would otherwise be very inexplicable, viz., the coolness with which the desertion of an eminent champion is sometimes taken by the main body. After the favouring voice of several years has given an individual a position, he goes, and the body would seem to be in a great difficulty. But it proceeds almost unconscious of its loss. The reason is, that the great man was its own creation. It made him, by its own act of setting him and keeping him up. The party itself, therefore, is the substance of the man. He cannot deprive it then of his substance, whatever he does, for that does not belong to him; but only of the residuum, which is left over and above the substance, that is to say, his own particular person. There are various degrees of the real and artificial in most reputations, and according as the one ingredient or the other predominates, the loss of the man is felt.

We may consider, then, that we have shown that, upon broad and general grounds, individuals are always amenable to criticism, and that the particular circumstances of our own Church and day, make it expedient to exert, occasionally, this right over them, the tendency of even honest and necessary party action being to over-estimate them and elevate them unduly.

No greater tribute can be paid to the character and services of Miss Sellon, than that we should think this long apology necessary before venturing to make the least independent criticism upon her proceedings. She may be assured that after all we feel ourselves not a little audacious; nevertheless having summoned spirit for the occasion, we shall speak with that freedom which is necessary for proper clearness and serviceableness.

We shall not go into details. The pamphlets before us are full of minute charges, affecting Miss Sellon's prudence, temper, and orthodoxy. She has refuted some of these particulars. We are willing to believe that she might refute more if she thought it requisite; and perhaps we could wish that she did think it requisite, for society has a claim upon her for every explanation which she can afford for its satisfaction.

But amidst much that is trivial and idle, these pamphlets reveal one point about Miss Sellon's institution, which we cannot pass over. The 'Rule of Obedience,' as enforced there, would seem to involve a very large and serious change upon the original purpose of the Sisterhood. We give it as

laid down in the rules of the Society—we say *rules*, for though Miss Sellon denies their formal and established character, calling them ‘a little sketch, or suggestive sketch of rules, which I was asked to write, which has passed from hand to hand, first in London and then elsewhere—I do not know who has it, I have not a copy;’ it appears, at any rate, that they exist in writing, and facts which come out show that she practically adopts them. The rule on the subject of ‘holy obedience’ runs thus: ‘Ye who have offered up to God your judgment and your will, must strive to persevere and grow in the submission ye have professed.’ . . . ‘Ye shall ever address the spiritual mother with honour and respect; avoid speaking of her among yourselves; cherish and obey her with holy love, without any murmur or sign of hesitation or repugnance, but simply, cordially, and promptly obey with cheerfulness, and banish from your mind any question as to the wisdom of the command given you. If ye fail in this, ye have failed to resist a temptation of the Evil One. Ye shall never discuss with any person, (except by express direction of the spiritual mother,) either within the Society or without it, the rules of the Order or the commands of the Superior . . . and ye shall make it a subject of immediate confession to your Superior, if ye have unhappily been betrayed into this error; and ye shall receive a penance, but no word of admonition or reproof for the same . . . ye shall learn, through daily control, observation and practice, that through the exercise of lowly and entire obedience ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost . . . If any sister fail in obedience, or resist with contumacy and rebellion, she shall be punished at discretion . . . Be ye well persuaded, that on negligence or exactitude in obedience depends the preservation of discipline, the purity of the Society, and the progress of each soul in the way of life.’

Now when the Sisterhood at Devonport was first established, it was established upon a very simple and natural basis—a basis, viz., of Christian charity and self-denial, as these virtues are ordinarily understood. There was a large poor population, destitute of spiritual instruction and care, and appealing to the pity of Christian society. To supply this want a Sisterhood was formed, to reside upon the spot, and engage personally in the work of visiting and educating; besides administering the alms entrusted to them. There was nothing in such an institution, either as regarded the labours of the Sisterhood, or the objects to which they were applied, but what harmonized with natural feelings. All men are agreed that it is advantageous that the poor should be visited, the ignorant instructed; and all are agreed that it is a good and charitable thing to visit and

instruct. Thus, though the particular form which the institution took was new and not common, the idea of duty to which the institution appealed was a common one, the idea which the Christian world at large has.

But this rule of obedience appeals to a very different standard from the common or recognised one. Here we feel at once that we are leaving the large and open field of Christian morals, and entering a much more confined, esoteric, and conventional one. The duty of obedience, stating it generally, is undoubtedly a natural and common-sense Christian duty, and one of the most important of existing duties. There can be no difference among Christians here. But on examining what the obedience, thus required by common Christian consent and feeling, is, we find that it is in every case limited by some natural consideration of use and purpose. Subjects are bound to obey the laws of the State under which they live; but it is because such obedience is necessary for the welfare of society. Soldiers are bound to obey the commands of the general; but it is because such obedience is necessary for the success of military undertakings. Servants are bound to obey their masters; but it is because such obedience is necessary for the order and management of a household. And generally all persons are bound to submit to those masters and directors to whom either Providence or voluntary engagement has attached them, on those points on which their authority applies; but it is only on those points, and not upon others, that obedience is incumbent on them. Here, then, is a natural limit of use and purpose, up to which obedience is obligatory, and beyond which it is not. The subjects of a State are not under any obligation to agree with or approve of its laws because they are bound to obey them. The same remark applies to the case of soldiers and servants. Even the parental authority, the most searching that nature presents, does not extend to a dominion over mind and conscience.

This, in a word, is the distinction between human authority and Divine. Divine authority extends to the conscience,—human authority only to the acts of men. When it is proved that such and such a command has been given by God, it is the duty of every human being not only to obey it in act, but to conform his own moral sense to it,—to think within himself that to be right and that to be wrong which Revelation announces respectively to be so. But human authority has no claim to the submission of the moral sense, but only of the outward conduct; because every man receives his moral sense immediately from God, and that which comes immediately from God cannot acknowledge any creature as absolute master. It is quite true that obedience, in these human relations, ought to

be as much as possible a cheerful and willing one. A person in a subject position ought always, if he *can*, to think his superior in the right, and ought to start with every bias in his favour. His obedience ought even to extend to the mind and conscience, so far as he ought reasonably to suppose his superior's mind and conscience to be better than his own on the matter in question. But whether he ought to suppose that or not, depends upon various circumstances of knowledge, opportunity, and relative position, and not upon any absolute law. A child ought to think its parent always right, for its intellect and conscience are in a very rudimental state, and therefore ought in all cases—for we will not contemplate at present any exception—to accommodate themselves to those of the parent. But as the child grows up, this duty is modified. A common soldier ought to take it for granted that his general is in the right in commanding any particular line of operation; or rather, he ought to pretend to no judgment at all in the matter. On the other hand, a superior officer, who is equally bound with the common soldier to pay the obedience of act, has much greater liberty of internal judgment,—a liberty which he not only may, but ought to use; otherwise he may be spoiling his own military eye, and depriving his country of future services. Any one who reflects will see that this pliable rule with regard to individual judgment secures all the humility and temper in its exercise which morality requires, providing as it does that every man should give way on those points on which his sense and knowledge are inferior. If people saw their own deficiencies properly, and drew this practical inference from them, nothing more would be wanted, but humility would be at once in operation on the amplest scale.

The duty of obedience, then, as owed from one man to another, is, as understood by the common sense and conscience of mankind, a limited thing. It rests for its foundation on the absolute need of such a rule of action for carrying on the system of things in which we are, and conducting any business whatever in which human interests are concerned, religious, political, or social. And when it has answered these purposes, it ceases to be obligatory and essential. The rule prescribes that everything shall be *done* which competent and authorized persons in the several departments of human life appoint. But, after securing full and proper action, it does not pry into the interior of the man, and command the motions of his mind and moral sense.

Now let us examine the Rule of Holy Obedience as put forth in Miss Sellon's code. No sensible person would grudge the Superior of such an institution as hers the amplest powers which are wanted for its efficient management. No sensible person, therefore, would grudge her very large rights over the obedience

of the inferior sisters. But does the 'Rule of Holy Obedience' limit itself to this practical object, and content itself with this useful jurisdiction? 'Ye shall banish from your mind,' it says, 'any question as to the wisdom of the command given you. If ye fail in this, ye have failed to resist a temptation of the Evil One. . . . Ye shall never discuss with any person, either within the Society or without, the rules of the Order or the commands of the Superior; . . . and ye shall make it a subject of immediate confession to your Superior, if ye have unhappily been betrayed into this error; and ye shall receive a penance, but no word of admonition or reproof for the same.' No sister, then, must ever express any opinion as to the Superior's acts and proceedings; and no sister must even entertain and harbour any opinion, if it is unfavourable. The rule stretches the duty of obedience beyond the sphere of action into that of word, and even into that of inward and secret thought. Now, the prohibition of outward expression of opinion, had the rule been limited to that, might perhaps have been defended on a practical ground; for it might be said that such expression tends to spread dissatisfaction among the members of a society, and so to enfeeble even necessary external obedience. To carry such a consideration as this, indeed, so far as to forbid absolutely all expression of opinion whatever, would appear to us a great overstretching of it; and a rule which took a middle line, and forbade formal, vehement, or promiscuous discussion, while it left a sister at liberty to make privately to another, as conversation might lead her, any remark that might occur to her on the Superior's proceedings, would not seem more than a due concession to the natural wants and claims of the human mind. Religious and educated ladies might be trusted to draw the distinction between a word of comment and an act of insubordination. An unqualified rule against 'discussion,' if by discussion is meant any intercourse of opinion whatever, does appear to us a gratuitous burden. Still there is some room for a practical ground of defence with regard to it. But how can it be said that it is necessary for the management of the institution, that no sister should *think*, with respect to any proceeding, differently from the Superior? Yet this is what the Rule says:—'Ye shall banish from your mind any question as to the wisdom of the command given you.' That is to say, the mind is to banish its own idea, and receive that of the Superior, in every instance in which there is any difference between the two. The very inner sense and judgment must be reduced to an agreement with those of another person. There can hardly be a pretence, to say that an institution which has the simple practical object of visiting the poor, teaching children in schools, and distributing

food and clothing in a destitute district, can positively not be carried on without this most extraordinary transmutation of one person's mind into another's. Cannot any person of ordinary capacity and good feeling be made to perceive that his judgment may differ from a superior's, but that he must do what the superior tells him? Is not this the commonest and most acknowledged distinction which society holds? But if it is a plain distinction at all, it excludes the necessity of any such obedience as Miss Sellon's rule describes, so far as the legitimate objects of her institution are concerned.

Here then we see insisted on an obedience which is not the plain and commonly understood duty, but a peculiar and esoteric one; an obedience which is released from the tie of a practical end and purpose. It may be thought by some that the duty gains in dignity and depth by such a release. We do not think so. It becomes unmeasured indeed, and expands indefinitely, when released from this tie: but measure is no degradation, if there is a good and sufficient reason for it, if it is the nature of the duty to be measured; while, on the other hand, the separation of a duty from the great objects and uses for which it exists, makes it insipid and meaningless. Removed from a solid basis, it hangs suspended in the air, an idle absurd thing, without place in nature. Utility is that which really ennobles it; that which makes the rational being not ashamed, but proud, of being obedient. Man works, and is proud of working, because the divine decree has gone forth which makes labour necessary for the welfare of mankind. So he obeys, and is proud of obeying, because obedience is necessary for the same end. He knows there must be order, system, subordination; otherwise no work under the heavens can go on, and the world must come to a stand-still. He consents then with satisfaction to making himself so useful, so serviceable: he is, though but one, yet one of the countless props on which the world, under Providence, rests. But to an obedience independent of object and use, to an individual as such, where is the call? A man meets you in the streets, and says, Obey me,—you will find obedience salutary; it is good to abandon your own will. What do you say to such a request? you say naturally, Obedience is good, but why should I obey *you*? why should I accommodate my mind to yours, any more than you yours to mine? It is thus that the severed and isolated duty is cast off, like dross from the great system of human life; no pathway of reason conducts to it. How can I be satisfied with obeying you, because you are yourself in the year 1852? What jurisdiction does that circumstance create? And just as obedience to an individual as such is absurd, so obedience to an individual who possesses over you legitimate

authority for a practical object, is absurd so far as it is claimed beyond that object. Miss Sellon differs from a man who meets you in the streets in this,—that she starts with a real claim. But so far as she exceeds that claim, so far she is exactly in the position of the man who meets you in the streets. The Superior of the sisterhood at Davenport can only claim obedience so far as concerns the welfare of her institution; if she claims any more than this, she claims it as Miss Sellon. But why should Miss Sellon be obeyed, more than any other intelligent and religious young lady in Her Majesty's dominions?

We cannot, indeed, but pause an instant to observe what appears to us an inconvenient consequence of such a rule. If obedience performs so absorbing a part in the formation of the Christian character in a sisterhood, it seems a pity that the Superior should be deprived of so essential an advantage. Who has so much claim to the beneficial influence of the institution as a school of spiritual education, as she who contributes most to it, the head herself? But upon this rule she is excluded from the benefit. Obedience indeed pervades the establishment from one end to the other, but most unfortunately she receives it, and does not pay it. She is condemned to the unprofitable side of the action, while all the rest are flourishing upon the fertility and the fatness of the side opposite; she famishes in the midst of plenty, and is mocked by a luxuriance all around her, which she cannot touch. We could indeed admire the generosity of the sacrifice, but justice is too alive to its severity. It is too romantic, too sharp a self-denial to order, under such circumstances, instead of obey, control instead of submit, dictate to others instead of being dictated to, and insist on your neighbour succumbing to your mould, instead of claiming your right of admission to his. Not that Miss Sellon is not equal even to such a trial, but it should not be required of her. For it must be remembered that the exchange is not simply of a privileged state for one without such privilege, but of a privileged state for one that has directly the contrary properties. For there is no argument upon which obedience is proved to be salutary, by which a situation of command is not at the same time proved to be dangerous. Were the obedience we speak of indeed only one ingredient among others in the formation of a spiritual character, its loss might be supplied by some other trial; though in that case there would be no necessity to make this duty so dominant and absorbing. But if it is endowed with these exclusive powers, and made the one channel to perfection, then its loss must be irremediable.

The remark then that we made to begin with, that whereas Miss Sellon's institution, at its first establishment, appealed to

the large and commonly recognised standard of Christian duty, it has now formed an alliance with another and conventional standard, has, we fear, been verified. We cannot but regard this 'rule of holy obedience,' as a foreign element introduced into the ethics of the institution, gratuitous, esoteric, and artificial; and consider that so far as the institution has adopted it, so far it has diverged from its original purpose. Nobody wanted Miss Sellon to become the head of a new school of spiritual education, and embody a new theory of Christian ethics. She was wanted for the practical purpose of teaching, visiting, and administering charity in a destitute population, and for the superintendence of the labours of others like herself for that purpose. It was thought that the members of the sisterhood were under her for that purpose, and not for the purpose of being themselves operated on, and used as the material for exemplifying an idea. They were considered her coadjutors, not her subject matter. And doubtless they are her coadjutors now; but it is difficult not to see that the other aspect of them is at least as favourite a one in the mind of their Superior.

We may add to the unsoundness of such a standard of obedience in itself, some bad effects which will follow from it, affecting the institution itself and the cause of such institutions in general. While Miss Sellon has gathered around her, and will gather, some earnest and valuable minds, who happen to be cast in a mould congenial to such a yoke, she will exclude many others of a stronger and firmer mould, who cannot and ought not to submit to it. She has narrowed her ground. Nor can we forget the fact, however particular circumstances may modify our inference from it, that already, in two different instances, sisters have left her establishment, scandalized at it, and declaring themselves unable to bear its peculiar rules longer. These facts, after giving all due weight to the explanation which has been given of them, leave on an impartial mind the impression that the bow has been bent too tight. Moreover, the cause of sisterhoods in general has suffered from this new development of this one; for the impression has been left upon the public mind, that such institutions are necessarily connected with an artificial religious standard, and that they do not rest upon any large ground of Christian principle.

And as we cannot approve of this change itself, so neither can we approve of the mode in which this and other changes were introduced, and cannot but consider that some grave claims were unattended to in the process.

The institution at Devonport commenced with a body of rules. There was a rule, for example, to guard the liberty of the sisters, giving 'free liberty to any sister to withdraw, if it shall

so seem good to her.' There was a rule to guard the property of the sisters: 'that any sister so withdrawing, or in any way ceasing to be a member of the Society, shall be entitled to her own personal property.'

But the Institution at Devonport had not only rules, but a Visitor. The Bishop of the diocese consented, at the request of the Superior, to undertake that office. It was thus a complete institution in its formation; with a set of rules, and an official interpreter of those rules, in case any question or doubt arose.

Under these circumstances one step would seem to have been right and necessary before introducing any changes in the basis of the institution, or departing from the natural construction of the existing rules. The Superior had no right to do this without first consulting the Visitor. But this, we regret to say, Miss Sellon did, and that largely. We refer to the letter of the Visitor himself on the subject:—

'I frankly avow that I do not think those rules form any longer a true criterion of the nature of your institution. Let me cite the two first of them:—

' "I. A legal instrument has been prepared, by which certain of the sisters have agreed to live together (conforming to certain regulations sanctioned by the Bishop, for the better conduct of the interior of the institution), but *with free liberty to any sister to withdraw, if it shall so seem good to her.*"

' This was the prime, the fundamental principle on which I consented to be your Visitor. That it has been knowingly and intentionally departed from I am very far from saying. You are incapable of knowingly departing from any condition under which you have ever placed yourself; yet that it has been *virtually* abandoned, is, in my judgment, manifest, not merely from the portion of your letter to Miss —, cited in the pamphlet of Mr. Spurrell, p. 39, but also from your own comment in your "Reply," p. 9, and still more from your observations, in p. 21, on "the sacred calling," "the calling of God" to your sisterhood, and the sinfulness of "looking back" in any who "had perceived this calling, and who having, after due trial, given herself to it, had yet retracted."

' I avoid entering into consideration of the sacredness of such a calling, still more into the question whether it be of such a kind that to relinquish it is indeed, as you scruple not to declare, "yielding to temptation, as did Demas," who, be it remembered, forsook an apostle, and with him the service of his divine Lord, "loving this world rather than to suffer hardships." I enter not into this consideration, I say, because it is enough for my present purpose to show the virtual inconsistency of such a calling with the first fundamental rule of your institution, that there be "free liberty to every sister to withdraw, if it shall so seem good to her."

' Now let me not be misunderstood. I am very far from blaming you and the sisters at aiming at what is impossible, when you and they have listened to "that voice in the heart which bids it think no longer of earth, which calls the soul to live only for the Lord, in bringing other souls to Him." I only mean that this is a course of life beyond and above that which was contemplated when I accepted the office of your Visitor.

' II. Again, with regard to your second rule:—"That any sister so withdrawing, or in any way ceasing to be a member of the Society, shall be entitled to her own personal property; but neither she nor her heirs shall be entitled to any share of the common property of the Society."

management of her sisterhood. And now the reader may ask, what practical conclusion is to be drawn? Are those who have hitherto supported the institution to continue to support it, or not?—those, we mean, who have supported it hitherto upon the understanding that the principles upon which it was managed were such as the ordinary Churchman acknowledges, but who now discover that that standard has been departed from.

Now, with regard to this question, we must at the outset admit, that the institution does in one respect stand on a different ground from that on which it stood before the recent events, and that that difference of ground does affect the appeal to the members of our Church, as far as it goes. As an institution proceeding upon a set of rules, of which a Bishop of the Church was the official interpreter and guardian, it gave a pledge to members of the Church that it would adhere to a certain standard. That pledge it does not now give. It has no longer an official connexion, and stands on an independent ground. Moreover, it has actually diverged from the recognised standard. But these admissions made, leave, we think, still a large and ample ground on which the institution may appeal to public support. On the practical question of support, it is not whether *any* divergence at all from an approved standard, but *how much*, has taken place, that is to be decided.

We could wish this distinction were more commonly attended to than it is. It is, indeed, a most important one, one essential to every mind that is bent upon acting fairly by all persons and all objects and causes that it has to deal with. And yet how much it is lost sight of; how do multitudes of men, as a matter of course, upon the first sight of any one exceptionable element in an undertaking, however many others there may be good, start back; the immediate impulse being that they will have nothing to do with it. How do others, who have sufficient good sense to distinguish between what is obviously trivial and what is of importance, yet suppose, as a matter of course, that *any* importance whatever is enough to make a ground of separation. In matters social or political the unreasonableness of such a rule is soon seen, and men agree to differ even on points of acknowledged importance, to forward some common object. But in religion it is otherwise; any importance at all is immediately considered to be fundamental.

The rule which general sense and fairness seem to establish in cases of individual exertion, where it serves important objects, and is made at great cost and sacrifice to the person, is this; that in proportion to the sacrifice he makes and the talents he contributes to an undertaking, he ought to be allowed to have his own way in the management of it. We say this, leaving to be understood the proper exceptions to such a rule, and proper

limitations of its meaning. No amount of sacrifice or ability on the part of an individual in conducting an undertaking, is any reason why we should allow anything which we think essentially wrong. Again, no amount of sacrifice or ability give him the right to demand our *approval* even of what we allow. But reserving our approval, and excepting essential points, a large field is still left of allowance in things not essential. Let us not grudge him his own way to a large amount within these limits. If he has any peculiarities, let him indulge them; if he has favourite ideas, let him bring them out. Expect him to give the undertaking the mould, in some measure, of his own mind. If he is not allowed a fair amount of his own way, the result is, that he throws up the matter altogether, and that society is deprived of his services. The very charm, to a large extent, of the work to him,—that which keeps him close to it and enables him to undergo so much toil in the prosecution of it,—is the employment it affords to his own individual biasses, tastes, and ideas. He likes to feel the individual element within him energizing; that he himself—as distinguished from all other mortals that ever have been, are, or will be—is doing something. He enjoys the sensation of a productive, as distinguished from an inert individuality, one which impresses itself on the world without, and makes some portion at least of nature—*rerum natura*—however limited, obedient to it.

When, three or four years ago, a large, enthusiastic, and then unsuppressed party in France were agitating for the regeneration of the social system upon principles of pure equality and benevolence; when the Socialists were contending for a new commercial basis, viz. that all should contribute labour and skill to one large object, the good of the community; the individual being content to receive as the reward of his exertions, however great, his own share, however small, of the general product, they were met in the National Assembly by an argument. The man of the most acute practical intellect in that assembly, and its ablest and most commanding speaker, who did not disdain, moreover, on the occasion, to borrow from the pages of a writer even more philosophic and acute than himself,—M. Thiers, repeating Hume, said this simply—(if we give the kernel of the argument it will be enough.) He said—If you want to have certain effects produced in the world, you must have a *motive* which is *strong* enough to produce them. Society wants to have produced for it, the effects—trade, manufacture, art, skill, labour, capital—the whole commercial system. The only motive which is strong enough to produce these effects, is the motive of private interest. Give the individual a private interest in the result of his labours, allow him to look forward to the possession of an estate, the founding of a family, and he will work as hard as you like.

And the result will extend from himself to society at large. The public will ultimately profit by that which private interest set going. Discoveries will be made, skill improved, system extended, and a whole commercial world arise upon this principle. But this is the only principle which is strong enough to produce these effects. Introduce in its stead a general benevolence, and the whole fabric will fall from simple want of support. The latter is too weak a motive to work upon.

The great ancient moral philosopher applied the same principle to a much more delicate and sensitive subject. We have not his great work by our side at present, and must use the recollections of many years ago, under the correction, if they or their application be erroneous, of the friendly reader who knows better. Aristotle treats the subject of morals in an order, as it may be called, first abstract and next concrete. First the important questions are settled, that virtue is necessary for happiness, and that such and such habits are virtues. An elaborate catalogue of these noble habits is given, and each is described with great accuracy and completeness. But at this stage of the treatise,—that is to say, every part of an exalted moral character having been successfully drawn,—the mind of the great pagan appears to be impressed with some apprehension respecting its embodiment. He appears to see some great difficulties in the way of the actual man exhibiting these perfections, at any rate on a triumphant scale. And yet his philosophy would demand that there should be such persons in the world, and that they should be more than one or two: for his idea of existence was confined to this world, and therefore he would naturally expect that this world should be able to produce in a good and sufficient number of instances, the perfect character; otherwise, we have ideas which are not realized effectually, and nature is guilty of a fiction. In this difficulty he has recourse to the same eminently serviceable principle to which Hume and M. Thiers appeal. The virtues of the good man, are allowed to grow up *περὶ αὐτὸν*,—‘about himself.’ The permission is a significant one, too significant. However, once given, the convenience of it is felt. Virtue becomes a more practicable thing, the path to perfection much more commodious. The ‘good man’ is made the member of a state, a leading member. In this capacity he does noble services to his country, fellow-citizens, and friends: he exhibits, in doing them, wisdom, magnanimity, benevolence, courage, &c. But all this moral formation goes on *περὶ αὐτὸν*, ‘about himself;’ his position is greatly improved by means of it, and virtue is the highest, the purest, and the noblest engine, but still the engine of promotion. Under such fostering influences, she has a splendid growth; she makes powerful strides in the individual, the whole community

outside looking on; till at last, commanding universal respect, he grows into a model, and the highest combination of position, reputation, and ethics stands before us. The character is not unlike that of the modern statesman of the higher class: one who is attentive to the improvement of public morals, and adopts a conscientious and honourable standard of public service. Such a man exhibits high public virtues, and a moral formation may be said to go on in his case, *περὶ αὐτὸν*, about self. The stimulus of an honourable ambition, the idea of the career which he has to fulfil, sustains his ethical aims, tastes, and labours.

It is thus that Aristotle produces an embodiment of the virtues. He saw that a strong motive was wanted to put in effective action the moral powers of man, and he supplies one. The motive is one indeed which has a more suitable application in the commercial world than in the moral, and produces the physical good of the community more faithfully than the virtue of the individual. But either application will do for the purpose of illustration.

That which the motive of private interest, then, effects in the material system of society, religious bias and peculiarity effect in the world of religion. There is a department of large and general religious truth which all in the same Church acknowledge; and there is a department of peculiar and controversial truth, which some think to be truth, and others not. The tendency of human nature is to take much more interest in the latter than in the former department of truth. Large and general truth has no charm for many minds. But set them upon some idea which they are conscious is rather peculiar to themselves, and which appeals to the resources of their own private and particular treasury of thought, and they are all alive: they want to communicate it to others; they become teachers. If they are preachers, they will begin sometimes with common and acknowledged truths, but the discourse soon falls into the private channel. This is the stimulus which makes them interested, zealous, and active, about religious truth at all. If they are practical workers in the Church, they try to impress the peculiar, the favourite sentiment upon their work. That is their stimulus to production. Do not most of us know men with whom the alternative would simply be between a working peculiarity and a total inertness, who if they were not arbitrary would be weak, and who make a bargain with religion at the outset, to colour her, or take no trouble about her? And yet the services of such minds are not to be lost to religion. It is better that they should teach a coloured truth, provided no vital part is affected, rather than not teach at all; and that they should do a mixed work rather than none. Indeed, we are here con-

cerned with a mysterious question relating to the human mind, which we shall not try to solve. For in the present narrow condition of our faculties, cannot we conceive it to be a sort of impossibility with many that they should embrace truth, other than in this way; inasmuch as if they admit it into their minds at all, it cannot be by any other opening than such as their minds have? May not the very instrument for attaining all the compass of thought possible for them, be this very individuality, which operates as a quickening principle, sharpening the sense while it confines it, and causing whatever appreciation even of truth, general and large, such minds can attain to?

If this is the case, then, it is to the advantage of the Church that it should acknowledge and avail itself of this principle, allowing for the bad results which may follow, together with the good ones, in its working. The work of religion in the world is conducted by individuals; the consequence is a mixture. But those who know the laws upon which the human mind acts, will expect no less. And they will expect it most in the case of those very persons who are most anxious to do good, for in the zealous and the energetic the individual element is most strong. Undertakings large and important for the benefit of society are not begun without some great impulse; but a strong impulse is more difficult to regulate than a weak one, and must often go further than the mark. The rule, then, that we laid down applies: if those who have all the trouble and pains of sustaining an undertaking do impart to it some peculiarity from their own minds, let us not be surprised, or complain too bitterly. Go through the wide world, and you will see pervading every department a rule—the rule of *quid pro quo*. Search east and west, north and south, look high and look low; in society, trade, politics, it is the same law, and you cannot escape it. Those who give will take, those who expend their own strength will indulge their own bias, and those who do the work will claim their own way of doing it. Do not demand, then, that a work shall comply with your own standard before you support it. You will never see such a work, and will have to wait till doomsday. There will be always something to object to, some divergence from your own idea. Some persons do, indeed, go on to the last day of their lives, wondering why others do not see as they do; the fact never ceases to surprise them, and after the experience of the whole day long retains the first freshness of the early dawn. They go on to the last, having their model, to which everything whatever done must come up, at the cost of absolute offence, if it does not. But of such it is only necessary to say, that it is marvellous how they do not see those laws of human action which obtrude themselves upon their observation every day. There is certainly a primary difference between

minds, that some do, and others do not, see the world which they are in.

The question then is, whether Miss Sellon's institution has diverged from the standard, which the body of our Church people recognise, *more* than is fairly tolerable, and may be allowed, though not approved? And to that we answer decidedly, No! We regret, and have given our reasons why, the turn which she has of late given to her institution, her extravagant demand upon the obedience of her sisterhood, and other changes. Such a demand is itself improper, and cannot work well either for her own sisterhood, or the cause of sisterhoods generally. Still we see nothing in it but what comes within the pale of Christian liberty. If any society of young ladies choose voluntarily to put themselves under Miss Sellon's guidance, and accept her judgment on all points, so long as she does not tell them to do what is wrong, we do not see why they should be interfered with. They have a right to do what they will with their own, and if they deliver up their own judgment to another, it is yet their own judgment, and not any body's else, that they give up. And if such submission leads them to spend their lives in visiting the poor, and instructing children in schools, it is not a result which either the Church or the community can complain of.

It has been the fault of the English Church that it has been over jealous of its own standard, and looked with too much suspicion on zeal and energy wherever they have at all deviated from it. This is an old topic. There is the case of Wesley and the Methodists in the last century. This jealousy does, indeed, lie very deep in the main body of our people. They will allow no interval between the substantial squire's, the reputable tradesman's model, and fatuity. And yet there is a cry on all sides for workers. We hear how much is wanted to be done, how the people are perishing for want of knowledge, and vice reigning in our crowded cities. But the worker comes, and because he does not do his work exactly in the way we want, he is dismissed. But if we wait for the convenient and accommodating workman, who will take all the trouble and have none of the choice, we shall wait long enough. Here is a case in point—the very case before us. Here is an institution which has been at work about three years, and in that short time it has managed to diverge considerably from the original idea on which it was raised. Shall we suppress this institution then that diverges, and have another which does not? So be it; and let us suppose another institution raised: and in three more years it will diverge like its predecessor. We do not say this always must be the case; but in a greater or less degree it is to be expected. And so we shall go on for ever inviting labour and dismissing it,

raising fabrics and destroying them. The correct, the model institution, which is to work faultlessly, will never come. How idle is such a course; how unworthy of serious minds, who want good to be done, know there must be workmen to do it, and know the laws of work! See the necessities of the case then, and submit to them. Keep your workman, with his peculiarities, and use his large zeal, his unwearied activity, his noble devotion and self-denial. In a word, be liberal. Let the Church of England be a Church, and not a sect; an empire, not a club. It is the characteristic of empire to be omnigenous; to include as many forms and species, as many laws, customs, nations, and languages, as possible. An empire cannot be stiff; it is contrary to the law of its existence to be so. Until our people learn this liberality and largeness of heart, until the despotism of one model is put down, the Church cannot make use of her resources, but there will be a perpetual waste going on. It is a thing never to be lost sight of, that the despotism of this model ought one day to be deposed. Let no opportunity be lost of showing people how much they lose by their mistake. Let them be at any rate told that it is a mistake. It is something for them to hear such a thing said. Repetition impresses the imagination even where the reason is preoccupied, and a process which has domesticated countless absurdities may promote, perhaps, one truth. Such resistance may be thought the height of absurdity, but the fact is, at any rate, seen that it is made. The Church of England never has yet learned, indeed, this lesson of true liberality, but there is no reason why she should not. There is no impossibility in the case—none, at any rate, of which we are informed, from natural sources.

We have endeavoured to exhibit in this article the combination of a right with a duty, or rather of one duty with another; and we will repeat it at the close, as our advice to any person who may think us in the position to give advice, with respect to the proper posture of mind to assume towards the case of Miss Sellon, and all other such cases. First, use your judgment independently on the right and wrong of any proceedings which come before you, be the agents who they may. Whether particular defects of knowledge or understanding may make you an exception to it, you must of course decide; but this is the general rule. Secondly, when you have made your judgment on the act, do not let it separate you from the agent, or his work and object as a whole. Exercise the strength of your judgment, control its pedantry and arbitrariness. Be independent in opinion, social in action. Give your support to undertakings which on the whole do good, and do not think too much of a few irregularities or obliquities attaching to them.

ART. VI.—*Les Provinciales ; et leur Réfutation. Par M. l'Abbé MAYNARD, Chanoine Honoraire de Poitiers. Ouvrage dédié à Mons. de Vesins, Evêque d'Agen.* Paris: 1851. 2 vols. Svo.

THIS is a curious book. Pascal's famous Letters elicited, at the time of their publication, a vigorous defence on the part of the great order whom they had attacked so unceremoniously ; but of that fierce and eventful controversy they are now almost the sole memorials. It may be supposed that the able and shrewd men against whom they were directed, had something to say to them. As a company, the Jesuits possessed more available talent, more concentrated resources, more discipline, than any public body in Europe. They sifted and contradicted the 'Provincial Letters;' they explained with ingenuity, and even with wit. They made out, with much plausibility, that they had said nothing but what other people had said. But it is very hard now to get a sight of their books. We may look in vain in some of our most famous libraries: they seem all to have disappeared—the Jesuit books which Pascal attacked, and the Jesuit books which attacked Pascal; the Pères Bauny, and Binet, and Garasse, and Le Moyne, his victims, and their defenders, Pères Annat and Nouet, and Pirot and Pinthereau, and even the polite P. Daniel. This want, however, has been supplied by the work before us, an edition of the 'Provincial Letters,' with their refutation by the Abbé Maynard, a French ecclesiastic of some literary pretensions, who may stand very well for the Baunys and Daniels, now so seldom met with.

In noticing this book, we wish one thing distinctly to be understood. It is not that we are opening afresh these bygone scandals. It is M. Maynard who has brought them before us, to show us how he could dispose of them, by an elaborate and ostentatious refutation. And what we propose to consider, is not so much Pascal and his charges, as the way in which M. Maynard deals with them, and the light which his statements, whether in attack or defence, throw on the practical system and feelings of those in whose behalf he speaks. We notice the book the more, because it is a characteristic specimen of the style and spirit which mark the school of Joseph de Maistre—of the line of argument which they adopt—of the self-complacent contempt of facts, the extravagance of misrepresentation and even calumny, which seem to sit so lightly on the consciences, and are expressed so glibly by the pens, of the disciples of that

master of brilliant and insolent theory, who bids fair to become the acknowledged exponent of the principles of modern Romanism.

The book is what we might call in England a 'Family Pascal.' Pascal's 'Provincial Letters,' says the Abbé Maynard, have done more harm to the cause of religion and the Church in France, than perhaps any other book in the French language. They are the most hypocritical and lying production of the most hypocritical sect of heretics, that ever assailed Christianity. Yet they are so clever, that it is hopeless to expect that Frenchmen will ever cease to read them; and equally hopeless, that they will read the solid refutations which the Jesuits wrote of them. The effect of answers, he says, has only been like that of Père Daniel's book on James the Second's courtiers at St. Germain's, who were so delighted with the extracts that he gave from Pascal, in order to refute them, that they sent off at once to Paris for a copy of the *Provinciales*, and thought no more of Père Daniel. What is to be done in this case? says M. Maynard. Doubtless, the best would be, that the *Provinciales* should be forgotten, at any sacrifice to literature. But as this is past praying for, M. Maynard has taken the next best course. He has published, '*on the favourable opinion of the highest ecclesiastical authority existing in France*,' a new edition of the *Provinciales*, with all the attractions of Firmin Didot's elegant typography, and a collated text, accompanied with a running and popular refutation in the introductions and notes. The method is convenient, but it has its disadvantages. There is something ungracious in editing a great writer, avowedly to pick him to pieces. But in Pascal's case, it is also rather a perilous method; for we are apt to compare the note-maker with his victim; and a hostile editor of Pascal had need be a considerable person, to venture to place his remarks in proximity with their text, without running the risk of looking very like a lacquy, soliciting our attention to the faults of his master.

The Abbé Maynard, however, fully sensible, as he professes to be, of Pascal's genius, cannot be said to have any fear of this contrast. We might have expected that M. Maynard would have confined himself to careful rectifications of quotations or facts, and to comprehensive expositions of principles or systems. But the lively Abbé is not satisfied with the resources of theology and history. He adds to them the perilous ones of pleasantry. Over and above his heavier artillery, a running fire of sharp little sayings at the bottom of the page, makes answer to the rapid and deadly hits which succeed one another in the text. Besides carefully recording his opinion of the probability of everything that the Jesuits said or insinuated

against Pascal and his friends, as that Jansenius swindled for the benefit of his friend's nephew,¹ M. Maynard has enriched his edition, and thought to damage Pascal, by a vast quantity of brief notes, such as impatient readers scribble with pencil on the margin of irritating books—such, as we are sorry to find, have considerably damaged our own copy of his elegantly printed volumes. They are very commonly in the second person—direct addresses to the offending writer, or his Jesuit interlocutor. Now it is a brisk dialogue in which he pushes Pascal to the wall; now indignant interpellations, such as we used to see reported in the French Chamber; now ironical answers to Pascal's ironical questions; now apostrophes by single words, brief and emphatic:—*'Mensonge!'* *'Calomnie!'*—*'Pourquoi falsifier toujours?'*—*'Non, non! c'est pas vrai!'*—*'Courage, bon père,* (to the Jesuit speaker,) *'vous avez droit dans le fonds, quoique Pascal vous donne tort dans la forme.'*—*'Voilà ce qui est plaisant!'*—*'Mon Dieu! quel entêtement!'*—*'C'est le comble de l'impudence!'*—*'C'est une infamie!'*—*'Eh, misérables Gallicans, soyez donc conséquents avec vous-mêmes.'* *'Allons! voilà Gros-Jean qui en remontre à son curé, quelques docteurs pédants qui font la leçon aux Papes!'* Pascal observes that the Jesuits called him *'impie, bouffon, ignorant, farceur, imposteur, calomniateur, fourbe, hérétique Calviniste déguisé, disciple de Du Moulin, possédé d'une légion de diables, et tout ce qui vous plaît:'* the measured annotation says, *'Il y avait bien un peu de tout cela dans l'auteur des Lettres, moins peut-être la légion de diables.'* These sarcastic interjections are varied by others of candour or compassion. At the end of some merciless paragraph of Pascal's, we find his editor only laughing at the joke, *'Nous rions de tout notre cœur;'* or we have little bursts of *'Charmant!'*—*'Charmante satire du pédantisme de l'école!'* showing that he can appreciate the beauty which he deems so fatal. At the end of the ninth *Provinciale*, about the devotional novelties of Pères Bauny and Binet, Pascal adds a postscript to tell his correspondent that since he had written the letter, he had himself seen the books—*'ce sont des pièces dignes d'être vues.'* We used to think that this was part of the joke. But we were, it seems, mistaken. M. Maynard is both indignant and grieved:—*'Quoi! vous avez écrit une lettre sur des ouvrages que vous ne connaissiez pas, et que vous n'avez lus qu'ensuite! L'aveu est naïf, et se conçoit difficilement d'un homme ordinairement si habile; "mentita est iniquitas sibi."*—*'Preuve nouvelle,'* he adds, with a sympathetic allowance for genius, *'que le pauvre Pascal était victime de ses amis, acceptait aveuglement leurs mémoires, et se*

¹ Vol. ii. p. 233.

'faisait l'écho docile de leurs erreurs et de leurs passions.'—
Vol. i. p. 441.

These little explosive protests, in which he bandies irony with Pascal, are a curious method of turning the edge of the 'Provincial Letters.' His way of meeting their direct charges is equally remarkable.

Pascal's book, it appears, must be dealt with in a sweeping manner. The safe, and we should imagine, the old answer would be, that the Jesuits were not the Church; and that the relaxed and extravagant opinions which he attacked, were those of individuals, or, at worst, of an order, for which the Church was not responsible. It might be further observed, that lists of propositions, many of them the very ones which Pascal had quoted, were formally condemned shortly after by the Popes; and finally that the Church at length disclaimed the general policy of the Jesuits, showed that even their zeal and services could not excuse their errors, and publicly separated her cause from theirs, by formally dissolving the order. This is one line of defence. There are others also; as that Pascal hit a weak point, but exaggerated it; that he and his friends went as dangerously in one direction as the Jesuits did in the other; that it was really a dispute about speculative and open points, in which both parties lost their temper and their way. But these answers are too tame, have not enough of 'principle' in them, for the dashing philosophy of the disciple of De Maistre.

The Abbé Maynard is one of those eager combatants who disdain to do things by halves. The battle seems to him not worth gaining, unless he can gain one of those heroic ones in which every man of the enemy is killed on the spot, and not one of his own. He accepts the whole weight of the Jesuit case. One side was right without any wrong, and that was the Jesuits; the other wrong without any right, and that was the Jansenists. This is the simple issue, according to M. Maynard, of the quarrel which distracted the great Church of France, in its palmy days, for a century and a half.

At the same time, M. Maynard is far from giving up the charge against Pascal of gross falsehood and wilful misrepresentation in nearly every text that he cites. But the substance of the refutation is that in all the points which Pascal singled out for attack, whether doctrine, or morality, or discipline, he attacked in the Jesuits what is now universally accepted by the Church. The Abbé's ambition aims at a triumph short of nothing less than the brilliant one of putting Pascal out of court for ever, as being, after every allowance made for genius and bad company, a convicted and notorious liar, hypocrite, impostor, slanderer, and heretic.

After M. Maynard's book, it is to be supposed that no one can any longer entertain a doubt on the subject. He, and—if it will take his advice—the rest of the world, will leave Pascal in peace, and his Letters also. The following peroration shows how M. Maynard considers that he has accomplished his task, and is suggestive of the spirit in which he has worked:—

'We are at the end of this long controversy; what is there wanting to complete what we have said in the course of the discussion? For the first time for two centuries, all the documents relating to the cause have been submitted at once to the examination of the public. Well: without any presumption, it seems to us, that no man of fairness will hesitate to pronounce, that the Provincial Letters are the most notoriously calumnious charge ever framed by passion and hatred. As to Pascal himself, divided between our profound sympathy for his person, and our still greater love of Catholic truth, we feel, when we wish to judge him, that our thoughts become confused, and that our words die away on our lips. At the risk of scandalising many men of our days, we will say, nevertheless, that we would gladly tear a page out of his life, even if the provincial letters must go with it. But,—severe for a doctrine, and for a work which have been so fatal to religion in France, we have nothing but indulgence and compassion for the unhappy writer whose genius was made a tool of. Contrary to the majority of our contemporaries, we condemn the work and absolve the man; the reason is, that the work has been judged by the highest authority which exists in this world, and that no one has the right to disturb the ashes of the man, and to cite before his own tribunal his intentions and his memory.

'Son cercueil est fermé; Dieu l'a jugé; silence.'

'Le vrai malheur des Jesuites au dix-septième siècle,' he says, 'a été de n'avoir pas en un Pascal.'

But from M. Maynard himself we must go on to his statements. We propose to notice the ground which he takes against Pascal, first, historically; next, as disclosing the principles which he represents as established in his own communion. It is mainly for this latter purpose that we have given so much space to the subject. It may be as well, however, at starting, though we are not dealing with the controversy in itself, to say a few words on the alleged unfairness of Pascal.

We certainly do think that his charges, on the whole, are very serious, both in their matter and evidence; and also, that they reach beyond the Jesuits. But we certainly cannot defend Pascal as M. Maynard does the Jesuits. Few persons read him without more or less of misgiving as to his perfect fairness. Indeed, it is not unnatural that after such a sweeping victory of human wit, there should come a reaction; the mind feels disposed to be sceptical whether in reality the triumph could have been as complete as it appears. It seems to violate likelihood—to be more

¹ Vol. ii. pp. 440, 441.

than Providence, which is jealous of human pride, is wont to allot to man. And this natural suspicion is not without grounds. Pascal was by no means always fair, especially in the detail of his proof.

Pascal's Letters have the exaggeration, inseparable from an able, earnest, passionate attack,—the exaggeration of a clear statement and lucid arrangement of the case *on one side*; the exaggeration of ridicule and irony; the exaggeration of strong and indignant feeling. Further, they leave unsaid how the system which they attacked grew up; how long custom, and a general use not confined to the Jesuits, if it had made this system dangerous, had also in all probability, in a measure, corrected it, as it certainly in a degree excused it: and they leave the impression, that *that* was a distinct *intention*, which was mainly a *result*, not very coyly accepted and followed up. Further, he leaves unsaid, for he did not on principle acknowledge them, the practical necessities of a popular, and much more, of a fashionable religion—much the same under all circumstances, whether resisted as temptations, or accepted as facts.

As to his quotations, the Letters, we think, will bear favourable comparison with any work that deals as largely in controversial citations. He solemnly declares that he had looked into text and context of every passage that he used; and we can see no reason to doubt his belief that he was dealing fairly. Still it is undeniable, we think, that he is at times really, and still oftener, apparently, unfair in his use of passages. We say, apparently, where in quoting, he omits restrictions and conditions which in the context accompany some startling decision, because he feels them to be mere surplusage. Where the point of a passage really remains unaltered by qualifications, which seem put in simply for verbal show, Pascal makes little ceremony in sacrificing limitations which he thinks unmeaning or trifling, to the convenience of his own statement. And besides, it must be confessed, that it was an unlucky chance for his victims, clumsy writers, singularly confident in their formal methods and their own authority—coarse and technical about refinements which almost defy words, and not dreaming of any opposition but that logical one which was the delight and business of their lives,—to fall into the hands of Pascal. The skilfully chosen, and skilfully exhibited passage, which looks so monstrous in his pages, not seldom subsides in their own into mere grotesque absurdity; often too, what really illustrates the mischief of the whole system, seems to bear hard in each separate instance when pointed against individuals. But there are cases where he is substantially unfair; we will give an instance or two.

The following is a case which has been more than once quoted against Pascal. He is speaking of the *jolies questions* which Escobar and others have framed on the subject of fasting: it may be remembered how, as they proceed, they become more and more delicate and thoughtful for the penitent, who wishes to have a good conscience and not to fast. These questions and answers are not disputed by M. Maynard. He only sneers at Escobar, or else backs him with S. Thomas. As to the man coming of age an hour after midnight, and thus having a right to be let off, he dismisses it with 'c'est subtil, ridicule, si on le veut, mais *c'est vrai*. Puis, en quoi cela va-t-il à la corruption de la morale?'—there being no harm apparently in a director of conscience, or his penitent, being shufflers. At length, Pascal comes to the following climax:—

"O que cela est divertissant!" lui dis-je. "On ne s'en peut tirer," me répondit-il; "je passe les jours et les nuits à le lire; je ne fais autre chose." Le bon père, voyant que j'y prenais plaisir, en fut ravi; et continuant: "Voyez," dit-il, "encore ce trait de Filiutius, qui est un de ces vingt-quatre Jésuites, 'Celui qui s'est fatigué à quelque chose, comme à poursuivre une fille, *ad insequendam amicam*, est-il obligé de jeûner? Nullement. Mais s'il s'est fatigué exprès, pour être par là dispensé du jeûne, y sera-t-il tenu? Encore qu'il eût ce dessein formé, il n'y sera point obligé.'"—Vol. i. p. 233.

On this M. Maynard begins his note with a triumphant chuckle:—

"Oh! pour le coup, voilà Pascal pris en flagrant délit de falsification. D'abord, Filiuci n'est point l'inventeur du problème. La question avait été traitée bien avant lui par S. Antonin, Sylvestre, Médina, Sancius, et beaucoup d'autres auteurs étrangers à la Compagnie. De plus, la question n'était pas oiseuse. "Si vous vous souvenez," dit à ce propos M. Sainte Beuve, (*Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 59,) "qu'il se présentait souvent au tribunal de la confession des pénitents bien étranges, comme Louis XI. par exemple, ou Philippe II., ou Henri III., (je parle des plus connus,) pour qui c'était une affaire sérieuse de jeûner le lendemain d'un meurtre ou d'une course libertine, vous trouverez moins étranges les précautions et distinctions que Filiutius prescrivait à la date de 1626, et qu'on retrouverait plus ou moins chez les autres Casuistes de ce temps." Et maintenant abordons le texte de Filiuci, et traduisons-le littéralement. Ce sera moins joli que chez Pascal; mais dans toute cette longue discussion, ayons le courage de prendre pour adage le vers de Boileau:

"Rien n'est beau que le vrai, le vrai seul est aimable."

"Vous demanderez en second lieu," dit-il, "si celui qui se fatiguerait à mauvaise fin, comme à tuer un homme ou à poursuivre une fille, ou à quelque chose de semblable, serait tenu au jeûne. *Je réponds*, qu'il pécherait, il est vrai, par la mauvaise fin qu'il se propose; mais que la fatigue en étant résultée, il serait exempté du jeûne: à moins, disent quelques-uns, qu'il n'eût agi en fraude de la loi; mais les autres répondent mieux, que la faute consisterait à apporter une cause de rupture du jeûne, mais que, la cause posée, il n'y serait pas tenu." Qu'a fait Pascal? Il a arraché au texte de Filiuci le milieu et la fin, pour faire croire que le Jésuite exemptait de toute faute dans les singulières circonstances qu'il décrit.

Mais non, le Jésuite, comme tout le monde, *enverrait bien un pareil homme en enfer* ; seulement ce ne serait pas pour n'avoir pas jeûné, ne le pouvant faire, mais pour sa crime, et pour s'être mis dans l'impossibilité de jeûner, *Et il a raison, le bon Filiuci* ; car Pascal nous dira-t-il qu'un homme qui se serait fait saigner aux quatre membres pour ne pas jeûner, y serait obligé encore, malgré son épuisement complet ? Allons donc, ce serait absurde ! et il faut avoir un front Janséniste pour chercher à excuser Pascal comme a voulu le faire Nicole en répondant aux accusations du P. Nouet.¹—Vol. i. pp. 233, 234.

We will not excuse Pascal. He has left out what '*le bon Filiuci*' could ill afford to spare ; the worthy man certainly does admit that this 'strange penitent' would sin, though not about fasting, and Pascal takes no notice of the admission. But the considerateness, which remembered that to such '*very strange penitents as Louis XI., Philip II. and Henry III.*' it was '*a serious affair*' to fast after a murder, or a day of debauchery, and the 'precaution' which anxiously guarded against laying on their conscience under such circumstances one sin more, and was so careful to clear the murderer from the guilt of fast-breaking, is passed over by M. Maynard too lightly.

We will give another instance. In the Seventh Letter, Pascal quotes Lessius, (de Just. l. ii. c. 9. dub. 12, 19,) as saying that a man may resent a blow with the sword, not from vengeance, but to clear his own honour. He makes Lessius responsible for this doctrine. He does not say that Lessius qualifies it, doubts about it, puts it as a matter of any question whatever, or does anything but lay it down simply as a safe and practical rule of

¹ We give another specimen of the very subtle distinction between *what leads to a necessity*, and *what follows from a necessity*, or quasi-necessity. Lessius says, '*adulter se debito moderamine defendens, maritum interficit ; non est reus homicidii, sed occisio illa censetur fortuita.*' For he says, 'the original crime is only the remote cause and occasion ; and every man when he is hard pressed, is not bound to let himself be killed, but may defend himself. Then after maintaining his view, he proceeds in the following, in which we cannot help thinking of the *bonté* and *douceur* of Père Bauny's *brûleur des granges* :—'Adverte tamen, si suspicabatur adulter, talia incommoda [*i. e.* that he should kill the husband,] ex adulterio secutura, tenebatur ex charitate abstinere. Unde volendo adulterium committere, peccat non solum peccato adulterii, sed etiam contra charitatem proximi, quatenus per adulterium constituit se in necessitate damni proximo inferendi ; . . . quando tamen constitutus est in tali periculo, non peccat, etiamsi se defendendo, occidat alterum ; quia jus habet se defendendi. Idem dicendum, si imminente marito poterat fugere ; tenebatur enim ex charitate, si videbat inde marito periculum ; unde non fugiendo peccat contra charitatem proximi. Non tamen peccat, si postquam non potest amplius fugere, se defendendo, occidat invasorem : occisio enim illa, non est peccatum, sed effectus per accidens secutus ex peccato.'—Lessius, de Just. l. ii. c. 9. dub. 15. pp. 106, 107.

The sin *lasting on till a certain moment*, and then metaphysically vanishing, is singular enough. Still it may be taken as a philosophical analysis, whether right or wrong, yet purely speculative, of the action. On the other hand, we are told that these were not '*questions oiseuses*,' that they were *practically* necessary for delicate cases, for '*strange penitents*' like Louis XI. and Philip II.

action, as Escobar may be fairly said to do. But in fact it turns out that the real state of the case is this:—1. Lessius quotes it from some one else. 2. He gives arguments, by which it, and some other maxims of the same sort, may be supported. 3. He ends by saying, in the scholastic formula, that though ‘it is speculatively probable, it does not seem to be easily allowed in practice.’ That is, whether mildly or not, he does distinctly condemn the maxim; first, from the danger of hatred or vengeance in the agent; second, because likely to lead to other bloodshed.

Certainly, no one reading Pascal’s account would imagine that Lessius had said anything of the kind. Accordingly the Jesuits made the most of it against Pascal’s good faith, and Pascal answers them in his thirteenth Letter. They said that Lessius quoted it from some one else, and quoted it to ‘combat’ it; Pascal, that he quoted it to ‘follow’ it. Lessius’s style of ‘combating’ is of a very mild order: but Pascal is unfair nevertheless. His reply to the Jesuits, who quote *certain* words of *condemnation*, is that *these* words refer not to this case, but to another; which is true. But Pascal himself persists in shutting his eyes to the fact that Lessius had *spoken against* it, in some words, and in refusing him the benefit of what he *did* say:—‘Il ne se trouve pas,’ he maintains, ‘une seule parole de *condemnation* en ce lieu-là; mais il parle ainsi: “Il semble, qu’on n’en doit pas facilement permettre la pratique: *in praxi non videtur FACILE PERMITTENDA.*”’ This he will not admit to be any sort of real condemnation.

He further suppresses the fact, that he himself had originally taken no notice, except in a *general way*, of this limitation. And he tries very unfairly to weaken the force of the words themselves, a technical form of disapproval. Thus he begins with charging Lessius with inventing and maintaining a maxim, and he ends by really proving against him only that he discountenanced it in too mild language.

This is unfair. But in this, as in most other instances, if we criticise the accuser’s fairness, the case of the accused is not much mended. An inspection of the text only conveys more vividly the cool way in which Lessius entertains and has difficulties about the doubt, whether we may kill a man for a blow. M. Maynard is still better, and gives us the reason for Lessius’ hesitating and faint rejection,—*videtur non facile permittenda*. ‘If,’ says he, ‘Lessius does not speak more expressly, *it is out of respect for Victoria* (from whom he quotes); when he treats of murdering for *calumny*, he absolutely condemns the practice, *n’étant gêné-là par aucune autorité.*’ (Vol. ii. p. 135.)

We will add a third case, where unfairness seems to arise from

the two parties being at cross purposes. The Roman system is a great system of external legislation, yet bearing intimately on conscience. On the one hand, it must wear the technical form of ordinary law. The crimes it denounces have to be defined; the rules which apply to all penal enactments must govern and abridge its severity. But, on the other hand, it appeals to more than outward obedience; it claims the submission of the Christian in his conscience, as it is meant to provide for the good direction of his religious life; its penalties are assumed to touch his soul, even though applied by the rules of human punishment.¹ This was the long-established system in the Church to which Pascal, as well as the Jesuits, belonged. But in several of the questions between him and his answerers, each drops one side of this double system. He assumes solely its *practical object*; that Pope's Bulls, for instance, when they denounce, and enact punishment against, some particular crime, are to be taken in a broad and common-sense view, as intending as hard a blow as can be given against the crime in all its forms; and so he quotes, as specimens of explaining away authorities, in order to favour crime, cases where terms are defined, or penalties restricted. The Jesuits and their friends bring for answer, the necessary *method and practice* of such a system as the Canon law. Thus Pascal shows from Escobar, that a man who murders, not for money, but to oblige his friend, is not to be called an assassin:—

‘Le Pape Grég. XIV. a déclaré que les assassins sont indignes de jouir de l’asile des églises, et qu’on doit les en arracher. Cependant nos vingt-quatre vieillards disent, que tous ceux qui tuent en trahison ne doivent pas encourir la peine de cette bulle. Cela vous paraît être contraire; mais on l’accorde, en interprétant le mot d’*assassin*, comme ils le font par ces paroles. “Les assassins ne sont-ils pas indignes de jouir du privilège des églises par la bulle de Grég. XIV. Mais nous entendons par le mot d’assassins ceux qui ont reçu de l’argent pour tuer quelqu’un en trahison. D’où il arrive que ceux qui tuent sans en recevoir aucun prix, mais seulement pour obliger leurs amis, ne sont pas appelés assassins.”’—Lett. VI. vol. i. p. 254.

Now the result of this interpretation certainly is, either that *real* assassins get off, or that people may with truth think that he who is not *canonically* an assassin, is not a *real* assassin. Yet it is fair to remember, as M. Maynard reminds us, that it is primarily a question of legal definition. ‘The privilege of ‘sanctuary,’ he says, ‘has always been regarded in Italy as ‘very important.’² Abuses occurred, and were restrained by

¹ ‘Idem pontifex refert, quod Innoc. X. et Innoc. XII. *excommunicationem* inflixerunt, in eos qui in Ecclesiâ Vaticanâ *tabacum sumerent*; et eandem imposuit Urban. VIII. pro ecclesiis Hispanicis: sed Bened. XIII. omnes istas prohibitiones abstulit.’—*Liguori, Hom. Ap. Tr.* xv. p. iii. No. 38.

² Vol. i. pp. 254, 255.

bulls and censures; and the extent of these restraints gave further occasion to disputes between Churches and magistrates. This had to be settled as the interpretation of other legal terms—who were *assassins* in the view of the bull? And in penal matters, the maxim is, '*odiosa sunt restringenda et rigorosa applicanda.*' The effect of this mixture of civil and spiritual perils—of excommunication and hanging—in this system, is a fair question. But it is not the question that Pascal is here dealing with.

We might add other instances of summary and unfair ways of dealing with what he attacked. Pascal was as unceremonious or unscrupulous as powerful and earnest minds are apt to be in dealing with what they not only detest, but thoroughly despise. When he had made up his mind that he must be unsparing, he did not stop to think whether he made his victim too absurd. But the main question still remains. Pascal may have been guilty of more or less unfairness; under the disguise of a man of the world, he may have had in him a good deal of the partizan, and something of the Puritan. Still it is a question whether the state of things he alleges to have existed was substantially true; and if so, we may be excused for being curious to see how a modern French ecclesiastic volunteers to deal with it, especially when he presents his labours with considerable pomp, in all the luxury of typographical elegance, and introduces it to the world with the 'favourable opinion of the highest ecclesiastical authority in France.' We take it up not to go over the quarrels of the past, but to learn the principles and views of the present.

We shall find, that, first, he denies the existence, as a fact, of this corrupt moral teaching among the Jesuits, or indeed in the Church; and next, that he supports his assertion by absolutely identifying the teaching of the Jesuits at that day with the teaching of the Church at this. The question then remains, as to the view which he presents, of the nature of this teaching. These three points we shall attempt to illustrate as we proceed, and in this order.

First, as to the fact on which Pascal's attack rests, the existence and influence of a system of easy Casuistry. M. Maynard, as we have said, broadly denies it. There was nothing, he maintains, in the morals or the teaching of the period to warrant it; far less in that of the Jesuits. 'It is absurd,' he says, 'to suppose of the Society of Jesus that they taught bad "doctrine."' . . . 'Never was there a society, perhaps, which takes more precautions to maintain the purity of its doctrine and morality, and which, with this view, has recourse to rules more severe, and, it may be said, more exactly observed.' Nor will he allow of the distinction between the earlier and later Jesuits.

They strike him, on the contrary, by their unity of purpose and character. He quotes instances of their boldness and severity in the court of France:—‘En un mot, les Jésuites transigèrent-ils une seule fois avec l’immoralité dans la voluptueuse cour de Versailles?’ They harassed—P. Annat, especially, it is said in Bayle,¹ ‘*chagrinait tous les jours*’—Louis XIV.; ‘*lui permirent-ils jamais de conserver le dehors de la religion et de s’approcher des sacrements*, tant qu’il était livré à ses scandaleuses amours?’ . . . ‘Courage autant plus digne d’éloge, que chacun était pris d’admiration, ou du moins se taisait devant ces brillants désordres.’ . . . ‘Toutes les courtisanes eurent les Jésuites pour persécuteurs.’² ‘All the efforts,’ he observes, ‘which they made at the time of the *Provinciales* to refute the slanders of Pascal, prove clearly that the doctrines ascribed to them were not those which they applied to the direction of souls. One only among them, Père Pirot, wanted to defend them, and he was disavowed by his brethren.’³ And what inducement had they to do otherwise? ‘Eh! mon Dieu,’ exclaims their defender; ‘quel intérêt auraient donc eu les Jésuites à favoriser de tels crimes, eux si purs, qu’ils pourraient presque dire à leurs ennemis, avec l’auteur de toute innocence: *Quis ex vobis arguat me de peccato?*’⁴ There was, in reality, ‘as has been so well observed by Comte de Maistre, no *parti de la morale relâchée* in the Church.’⁵

Now, the report of history and common belief is, that there was,—and that it was found among the Jesuits. Not, as Voltaire puts it, and the Abbé after him, a party with the deliberate plan to corrupt morals,—which, as Voltaire observes, and might have recollected before he fathered absurdities on Pascal, ‘no society ever had, or can have,’—but a party formed for the purpose of directing morals, and which, in directing them, allowed them great liberties; a party which urged virtue where they could, but compromised, on principle, with disobedience, where they could not. Pascal has made no improbable charge, and has taken care to state it in terms which keep clear of the desirable exaggeration. He has but described, in the most exquisitely organized specimen of a party, the natural malady of all parties, even religious ones; and its effects, when exhibited on so large a scale.

‘Sachez donc que leur objet n’est pas de corrompre les mœurs; ce n’est pas leur dessein. Mais ils n’ont pas aussi pour unique but celui de les reformer; ce serait une mauvaise politique. Voici quelle est leur pensée. Ils ont assez bonne opinion d’eux-mêmes pour croire qu’il est utile et comme néces-

¹ ‘Il est dit dans Bayle.’ M. Maynard weighs his words; in Bayle, not by Bayle, but by the writer of a ‘*fabulous and satirical*’ work, from which Bayle quotes the passage referred to, for the purpose of showing up its anachronisms.

² Vol. i. pp. 178—180.

³ Vol. i. p. 209.

⁴ Vol. i. p. 204.

⁵ Vol. i. p. 185.

saire au bien de la religion que leur crédit s'étende partout, et qu'ils gouvernent toutes les consciences. Et parceque les maximes évangéliques et sévères sont propres pour gouverner quelques sortes de personnes, ils s'en servent dans ces occasions où elles leur sont favorables. Mais comme ces mêmes maximes ne s'accordent pas au dessein de la plupart des gens, ils les laissent à l'égard de ceux-là, afin d'avoir de quoi satisfaire tout le monde. C'est pour cette raison qu'ayant affaire à des personnes de toutes sortes de conditions et de nations si différentes, il est nécessaire qu'ils aient de Casuistes assortis à toute diversité. . . . C'est par cette conduite obligée et accommodante, comme l'appelle le Père Pétiau, qu'ils tendent les bras à tout le monde.'—Lett. V. vol. i. p. 218, 219.

Pascal may be elsewhere carried beyond this, in his disgust or indignation; and here he speaks as a partizan, when he implies that their 'severe directors' were but few—merely enough for a bait. M. Maynard has a right to remind us of the bright side of the Jesuits—of what they did for literature and piety—how, when Pères Annat, and Pinthereau, and Bauny were speculating or calling names in Paris, their brethren were dying at the stake of the Hurons, or under the sword of the Chinese—how the very Père Garasse, the buffoon of the *Provinciales*, asked, as a special favour, to wait on the plague-stricken people at Orleans, and died among them, and one of them. But Pascal is not unfair, if his facts are true, in making the Society, whose boasted excellence was its perfection of government, and absolute control over the very thoughts and will of its members, responsible for all that it sanctioned. The world heard a good deal, from itself, of its singular merit in this matter. It was only taking it at its word, if Pascal fixes on it what its superiors allowed their subjects to print, and obtrude with no little ostentation on the Church; if he assumes that 'un si grand corps ne subsisterait pas dans une conduite téméraire, et sans une âme qui le gouverne, et qui régle tous ses mouvements.'¹ Once for all it must be said, that even in his hands the charge was not, that the Jesuit institute had not great virtues, but that it had also great vices: '*neque virtute propriâ tantum profuerunt, quantum in hoc nocuerunt, quod aliorum virtutem corruerint et perdidierint.*'

¹ 'Outre,' he proceeds, 'qu'ils ont un ordre particulier de ne rien imprimer sans l'aveu de leurs supérieurs.' 'Pascal,' answers M. Maynard, 'donne à l'approbation à laquelle sont soumis, en vertu des constitutions de S. Ignace, tous les ouvrages de ses membres, un valeur et une signification chimérique. D'abord, cette approbation est imposée communément à tous les ouvrages religieux. Quant aux Jésuites, ce n'est pas le général qui lit les ouvrages . . . mais le provincial, aidé de deux ou trois examinateurs, qui se conforment dans leur jugement aux doctrines des divers pays où ils se trouvent. Ce jugement en conséquence n'est pas plus l'impression des idées de la Société, qu'il n'est irréfutable.'—Vol. i. p. 210. It hardly does for M. Maynard to call this giving 'une valeur et signification chimérique' to the licensing of books, when in the next page he argues from the rigour and practical success of the precautions taken, the absurdity of supposing that bad doctrine could have found its way into the order.

As to the evidence, we will only say that others of great name and authority besides Pascal spoke, at the time, as strongly as he did, both of the existence and dangers of this accommodating morality, as a feature of the time; and further, we will venture to engage that no one at this day, except he felt his position already compromised by it, would any more dream of saying a word in its justification, than he would of committing himself to the physics of the schoolmen, or the political maxims of Machiavelli. It was not Pascal who said,—*‘Certes, je ne vois rien dans le monde qui soit plus à charge à l’Eglise, que ces esprits vainement subtils, qui réduisent tout l’Evangile en problèmes, qui forment des incidents sur l’exécution de ses préceptes, qui fatiguent les casuistes par des consultations infinies, qui ne travaillent, en vérité, qu’à nous envelopper la règle des mœurs. Plus malheureux encore les docteurs indignes de ce nom, qui adhèrent à leurs sentiments, et donnent du poids à leurs folies. Ces sont des astres errants . . . ils confondent le ciel et la terre, et mêlent Jésus-Christ avec Bélial; mélange indigne de la piété Chrétienne; union monstrueuse qui déshonore la vérité, la simplicité, la pureté incorruptible du Christianisme.’* Pascal never said anything stronger: yet it was no Jansenist who wrote these words, but Bossuet, who goes on in the next paragraph to condemn with equal severity the rigour of the Jansenists: Bossuet, the man of strong good sense and impartial justice—Bossuet, in his panegyric on the very theologian, who first extracted and denounced the *Five Propositions* of Jansenius, the Grand Master of the College of Navarre, Nicolas Cornet—Bossuet, himself a director, and not an extravagantly severe one, celebrating the praises of another director, ‘whom all France knew, for he was consulted by all France,’—a theologian of the ‘ancient mark,’ as hostile to impracticable and ‘affected’ rigour, as to laxity and ‘affected ignorance.’ It was Nicolas Cornet, the enemy of Jansenism, who, according to Bossuet, showed himself equally implacable to those maxims, *‘moitié profanes et moitié saintes, moitié Chrétiennes et moitié mondaines; ou plutôt toutes mondaines et toutes profanes, parce qu’elles ne sont qu’à demi-Chrétiennes et à demi-saintes.’*

‘Nicolas Cornet,’ he goes on to say, ‘n’a jamais trouvé belles aucunes des couleurs de la *Simonie* . . . Il a condamné *l’usure* sous tous ses noms, et sous tous ses titres. Sa pudeur a toujours rougi de tous les *prétextes honnêtes* des engagements déshonnêtes, où il n’a épargné le fer et le feu pour éviter les périls des occasions prochaines. Les inventeurs trop subtils des vaines contentions et questions de néant, qui ne servent qu’à faire perdre, parmi des détours infinis, la trace toute droite de la vérité, lui ont paru, aussi bien qu’à S. Augustin, des hommes inconsiderés et volages—*“sufflantes pulverem et excitantes terram in oculis suis.”* Ces chicanes raffinées, ces subtilités en vaines distinctions, sont véritablement de la poussière souillée, de la terre dans les

yeux, qui ne font que troubler la vue. Enfin il n'a écouté aucun expédient pour accorder l'esprit et la chair, entre lesquels nous avons appris que la guerre doit être immortelle."¹

So wrote Bossuet in 1663. After an interval of many years, we find him still in the same mind. In the General Assembly of 1700 we find him urging, with all the earnestness and force of his character, the condemnation by the authority of the whole French Church of those 'monstrous opinions, which had so long 'caused scandal to the Church and to Europe, and which 'offended the sanctity of Christian morality in its purest and 'most certain maxims;' and he adds that, 'Si, contre toute 'vraisemblance, et par des considérations qu'il ne voulait ni 'supposer ni admettre, l'Assemblée se refusait à prononcer un 'jugement digne de l'Eglise Gallicane, *seul, il révélerait la voix 'dans un si pressant danger; seul, il révélerait à toute la terre 'une si honteuse prévarication; seul, il publierait la censure de tant 'd'erreurs monstrueuses.*'² Could Pascal have said more?

Bossuet saw a '*parti de la morale relâchée*' in the Church. He talked, as M. Maynard tells us, of 'two dangerous maladies 'which had afflicted in his days the body of the Church—one 'an extreme severity; the other, *une malheureuse et inhumaine 'complaisance, qui a pris quelques docteurs, une pitié meurtrière, 'qui leur a fait porter des coussins sous les coudes de pécheurs, 'chercher des couvertures à leurs passions, pour condescendre à 'leur vanité, et flatter leur ignorance affectée.*' And where did he find these doctors, whom, at the close of his career, he thought it his duty to impeach before the assembled Clergy of France? M. Maynard shall interpret Bossuet's words, for he named no one.³ It was among the Jesuits—the Jesuits, whom as an order he honoured, and among whom he had many friends.

But was it fair to lay all this on the Jesuits? It is true that Pascal attacked as peculiar to the Jesuits a system of casuistry

¹ Bossuet, 'Oraison Funèbre de Nicolas Cornet,' 1663, vol. xi. pp. 201, 203.

² Bausset, 'Hist. de Bossuet,' l. xi. No. 7.

³ 'These ideas prevailed in the Assembly of 1700—a great number of propositions were there denounced as being the doctrine of a party dangerous to Catholic morality. This was, on the part of the Jansenists of the Assembly, a lie; a mistake, and blind acquiescence, on the part of the rest, and even of Bossuet. How could Bossuet have said, that, if people spoke against Jansenism, without at the same time repressing the errors of the other party, the manifest iniquity of so visible a partiality would make men despise such a judgment, and think that there was the wish to spare half the evil? . . . What was this *other party*? Bossuet talked, indeed, of *priests and religions, of all orders and all habits*, but he used the words as a blind; and, in spite of this prudent generalization, no one could be understood but the Jesuits, who alone had been the subjects of discussion for half century, and whose authors had furnished nearly all the propositions submitted the censure. It is true that Louis XIV. forbade the mention by name of the suits in the censure, but all the world understood perfectly well who was meant.' —Vol. i. pp. 185, 186.

run to seed, which was pursued by theologians of other orders, and which was at least highly respected by the authorities of the Church. But it is true also, that no order did so much with it as the Jesuits. No order pursued it so systematically, with so much zest, and such unintermitting purpose.¹ It was one of their instruments in gaining that reputation of which no order ever made such parade,—the reputation for skill in directing consciences. They had no right to complain that the '*Praxis secundum Societatis Jesu*,' should be presented in as prominent and strong a light by others as the boasts of the '*Imago primi sæculi*' had been by themselves. They had no right to decline the odium of representing casuistry, who had claimed its first honours.

M. Maynard starts, as we see, with denying *in toto* the historical fact of the corruption either of doctrine or morals. But we shall understand him better when we know what principles guide his judgment. What Pascal thought once of putting into the mouth of his '*bon père*,'—'*Accordez-moi ce principe, que la Société et l'Eglise courent même fortune, et je vous prouverai tout*,'²—expresses without irony M. Maynard's view. That the Jesuits could not have been wrong, he maintains, follows from the broad fact that their doctrines were simply those of the Church. He states it as incontestable that what the Jesuits held, and their opponents attacked,—making allowance for open questions and individual mistakes, corrected as soon as noticed,—was but what every good Catholic now takes for granted. He lays down in strong terms, that in reality the '*Jesuits have no doctrine of their own*. They attach 'themselves immovably to the decisions of the Church; for the 'rest, either they follow the doctrines which are *most commonly* 'authorized, or in case of a divergence of opinions, they embrace the sentiment which pleases each, in all the liberty of 'thought.'³

Thus with the famous doctrine of Probability. As Pascal represents it, it is a curious perversion of the principle of authority—the application of it to legitimize doubt and licence. M. Maynard states, as its characteristic rule, that you may follow the *less* probable, as well as the *less* safe side, provided it is really probable. Such a rule is obviously vague enough to admit any application, from the boldest truism to the most bare-faced quibble. As expounded by Liguori, the S. Thomas of the modern school, it seems to be simply a theory to provide for and justify the natural and legitimate liberty of individual acts.

¹ Ste. Beuve, vol. iii. p. 67.

² Fangère, Fragments, vol. i. p. 297.

³ Vol. i. p. 211.

It does not seem to come to more than that when a *law* is uncertain, a man is not bound to its most rigid sense, but is left freely to other guidance. It is a poor and clumsy theory, based on the application to human life in general, of the maxims of equitable interpretation of *law* between man and man, or subject and ruler. But it does not present the singular features of Pascal's representation. It is otherwise, however, when we turn to the Casuists from whom he drew. There we recognise what he describes; there, what is prominent is, not the scope and purport of the theory, but the *practical idea and test of what is probable*, and its value in settling questions of conscience. There, the common sense rule of following a wiser or better man than ourselves when we can do nothing better, is turned into a universal and exclusive basis for conscience, and expanded into logical consequences. There we find it argued, that since it is prudent to trust those who are *in arte sua periti*, and to submit to the judgment of the wise and good, therefore it is prudent to follow Sanchez, and seventeen wise and good authors, whom he quotes, to prove the general maxim, that it is lawful in conscience to leave the *more* and follow the *less* probable opinion, even if it is less safe; that an opinion is *probable* which rests on a reason of some weight; that therefore the opinion of one good and learned doctor is probable, because such authority is not light but weighty; that one learned man may make his opinion, even to the unlearned who trusts him, more probable than the common opinion;—that the general opinion of the more recent authors cuts off, in general, appeal to older ones, as their vigilance is a sufficient guarantee that no error would be allowed to creep in;—that the same person may judge two opposite opinions equally probable.¹ Many common sense ways of acting might indeed come under these rules; but it is equally plain, that thus broadly stated, as exclusive or leading rules of any man's mind, they will lead him a long way, at least from common sense. They *may* mean anything; and their writers take no trouble to show that they *do not* mean the 'leadens rule' which they seem.

What does M. Maynard? He tells us that it was not a Jesuit but a Dominican invention, in 1598, which immediately was adopted universally in the Catholic schools, where all theologians were '*tenants passionnés du Probabilisme*.'² He gives his own

¹ Filliuc. Tr. xxi. c. 4. nn. 128—137. ('*Pénitencier du Pape à S. Pierre, et Casuiste en Chef du Saint-Office*,' Mayn. ii. 456.)

² Pascal might have seen a new illustration of its principles in the fact, that, according to M. Maynard, 'there was no religious order from whence issued such solid dissertations against it;' yet when Gonzalez wanted to publish his, so warmly was the company in general attached to the opinion, that they would not permit him; and Innocent XI. interposed his supreme authority in vain, *pour vaincre les opiniâtretés*; and even when Gonzalez became General of the Order, he had to publish not as General, but as an individual doctor.

exposition of 'Probabilism,' guarding it by cautions as vague as its rules. He admits Pascal's quotations. He makes no attempt to disprove his inferences, or allow us to judge by extracts whether the tone and spirit of the originals seem against them. But he charges him generally with misrepresentation, and tells us that his own, the Jesuits, and Liguori's view are all one with that of the Church. It is rather hard upon Pascal, considering that the very 'abuses' which the Church had to condemn were those which some Jesuits had allowed to pass current, and he had attacked.

'True Probabilism, which Pascal has so strangely misrepresented, confined within these limits, the Church has not condemned, nor will ever condemn; and recently she has yet further placed it out of the reach of any censure, by placing on her altars *S. Liguori*, who has, nevertheless, carried out its consequences to the very utmost.¹ In fact, apart from certain propositions condemned in some Jesuit writers, who had themselves borrowed them from older authors, there is the greatest analogy between the theology of *S. Liguori* and that with which Pascal reproaches the Society; since both one and the other are based on Probabilism, regard the diversity of opinions as allowed, useful, and even necessary; and since, moreover, the holy bishop draws from these common principles, in the way of inference, a great number of the propositions condemned in the "*Petites Lettres*" as subversive of all morality. The Church has confined itself to restraining the abuses of Probabilism, by condemning those propositions which reduced to nothing the conditions of true probability, or extended the application of the system to matters to which it is inapplicable, or drew from it forced consequences. . . . But the Church has never touched Probabilism itself; and if the Assembly of 1700 has disapproved of it, it did not pass any censure on it.'—Vol. i. pp. 197—199.

The Jesuits, M. Maynard maintains, never were, — never *would* be mistaken, except in the very best company in the Church. If they are wrong, he always takes care to say that they had *borrowed*. There is something quite amusing in the eagerness with which he transfers to the Church or her great doctors the responsibility of what Pascal attributes to the Jesuits. You cannot point out a reproach against the Jesuits, — seems to be constantly his language, — but I will find its match elsewhere, and that in the highest quarters. If the Jesuits are reproached for extravagant self-laudation in their book, '*Imago Primi Seculi*,' M. Maynard tells us that Franciscans and Dominicans were not only equally absurd, but impious, in the same way. After apologising for the legitimate enthusiasm and poetic feelings of the young Jesuits who composed it — a family trophy of the Order — and

¹ 'It is well known that in the process of canonization all the writings of the person are examined with the most minute and most severe attention; and if there be found in them one single proposition contrary to the faith or sound morality, the cause proceeds no further, and is stopped for ever.'—(Maynard's note.)

reproaching the 'cruelty' 'qu'il y avait à se moquer de cette tendresse filiale des enfants pour leur mère, à flétrir ce bonheur de famille, à étouffer cette ardeur juvénile qui s'élançait avec tant de confiance vers le bel avenir,' &c., M. Maynard observes that Franciscans and Dominicans did worse without exciting remark:—

'Comment les Jansenistes ne voulurent-ils pas se souvenir des "*Conformités de la Vie de S. François à la Vie de Jésus-Christ*," par F. Barthélemy de Pise, ouvrage extravagant et même impie; de l' "*Origo Seraphica Familiae Franciscanae*," du Capucin Gonzague; des "*Entrailles de la Ste. Vierge pour l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*," du Dominicain Chouques? Mais sous ce rapport, comme sous tous les autres, ce qui était excusable, même légitime, chez les enfants de S. François ou de S. Dominique, était un crime chez les fils de Loyola.'—Vol. i. p. 217.

There were Casuists, too, in the Church, he says, besides the Jesuits, and Casuists who said as strange things, though Pascal keeps it out of sight;—which, however, he scarcely did;—and the Jesuits did but follow out and perfect what had high and abundant sanction elsewhere. The Père Daniel, says M. Maynard, was able, doubtless not without some zest, to substitute for the Jesuit quotations in the Fifth *Provinciale* names and extracts of Dominicans, their keen rivals. 'Rappelons-nous,' he says, after Voltaire, (and—if the question of *degree*, and of the organization and power of the Jesuits, is set aside—with truth,) 'que les opinions reprochées aux Jésuites ne leur étaient point particulières, et qu'en leur substituant toutes les Universités de l'Europe, tous les ordres religieux qui existaient au dix-septième siècle, on aurait pu dire aussi bien des docteurs de Sorbonne, de Louvain, de Salamanque, des religieux de S. Dominique et de S. François, tout ce que dit Pascal des Jésuites dans les *Provinciales*.'¹ Thus, for instance, when Pascal quotes from Escobar, how you may hear mass in a very short time, namely, 'by hearing different portions of four masses simultaneously,' M. Maynard, in reply, points out to us that we must not smile: the opinion of which this is a consequence was considerable enough to have a history and growth, and at last the honour of a special limitation. *Dignus vindice nodus*. Viewing it as he does, we shall see in it and the kindred questions, a logical following out of certain truth—mistaken, indeed, as it has turned out, but which seemed so undeniable to all the great theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that no one ventured to oppose it except with the utmost hesitation. Thus Azor 'embraced with repugnance' that 'two successive halves made one mass,'—'entraîné, dit-il, par le nombre et le poids des autorités;' and those who, like the Jesuits Suarez and Lugo,

¹ Vol. i. p. 212.

resisted the torrent, looked with alarm at the array of great names against them,—‘se montrent effrayés de l'autorité et du nombre de ses défenseurs.’ If it is not so now, it is because Innocent XI. proscribed it; since which time, no theologian has defended it. We may admire, in passing, the singular mode of thought which affects not to be able to see the right and wrong of such a question, except by going to the Pope's decision; and excuses the wrong opinion as quite defensible, till condemned by him.

‘Ces diverses décisions ne sont pas également absurdes. Il a été longtemps reçu, parmi les théologiens, qu'on satisfaisait au précepte par l'audition successive de deux moitiés de messe; et ce sentiment, quoique faux, n'a jamais été condamné. Puis on a prétendu que cela serait vrai quand même l'ordre des parties serait interverti. Enfin, par une mauvaise conséquence d'une doctrine certaine, qu'on peut satisfaire simultanément au précepte de l'audition de la messe et au précepte de la récitation de l'office divin, et d'une doctrine probable qu'on satisfait par l'audition d'une seule messe à une triple obligation, provenant, par exemple, du précepte ecclésiastique, d'un vœu, de la pénitence sacramentelle, on en est venu à soutenir qu'on pouvait simultanément entendre deux ou plusieurs parties de messe, ce qui détruit entièrement l'intégrité du sacrifice. Cette doctrine a été proscrire par Innocent XI. (59^{me} Prop.), [*Satisfacit præcepto Ecclesiæ de audiendo sacro qui duas ejus partes, imo quatuor, simul a diversis celebrantibus audit*];—et depuis aucun théologien ne l'a défendu. Mais elle était auparavant fort commune, car on la trouve ainsi formulée dans presque tous les auteurs du seizième et du commencement du dix-septième siècle, Soto, Navarre, Medina, [Dominicans,] et ceux même qui embrassent un sentiment contraire, comme les Jésuites Suarez et De Lugo, se montrent effrayés de l'autorité et du nombre de ses défenseurs. Remarquons pourtant qu'on n'en faisait l'application qu'au précepte de l'Eglise; et que ses partisans eux-mêmes généralement en condamnaient la pratique.’—Vol. i. p. 439.

‘O mon père!’ cries Pascal also, tout effrayé, as he says, —and as a Frenchman well might be,—at the list of distinguished Casuists with extraordinary names cited by his *bon père*!—‘O mon père! tous ces gens-là, étaient-ils Chrétiens?’ ‘Comment, Chrétiens!’ is the tart reply; ‘ne vous disais-je que ‘ce sont les seuls par lesquels nous gouvernons aujourd'hui ‘toute la Chrétienté?’ M. Maynard is not pleased with the joke. ‘Ces noms barroques,’ he says, ‘que cite ici Pascal, et ‘qu'il livre à la risée publique, sont ceux des docteurs encore ‘estimés par tous les théologiens, de saints évêques, et même ‘d'hommes de génie, comme Suarez.’ There is truth and pertinence in the remark. It is Pascal against the great names of the Roman Church: he must be wrong, because he attacked them.

But it is convenient, in a conflict of diversified aspect, to have friends of different sorts, both too great to be attacked, and also not too great to be sacrificed; the one, to bear down

¹ Lett. V.

charges in the general, the other, to carry them off when they become pressing, in the particular. Vasquez and Suarez may confound Pascal by their imposing authority; still there are quotations for which the other sort are useful. He always thinks of Escobar and Bauny being obscure writers when he comes to some inconvenient quotation. 'Bauny is not a *savant Casuiste*,' he says, testily, when Pascal's Jesuit, *ce stupide interlocuteur de Pascal*, describes him as '*pénétrant dans le pour et le contre d'une même question, et trouvant raison partout*.'¹ Escobar is a *bonhomme*, *qui a trop, beaucoup trop écrit*. He gets quite impatient with such authorities. '*Encore Bauny! Que c'est ennuyeux*.'—'*Escobar, toujours Escobar, et rien qu'Escobar*.' What is Escobar, flanked by Bauny, to represent the Society? In Escobar and Bauny, he finds all that it is necessary to give up. Not that this, after all, is very much; for the reason is always at hand, that their words are quoted by Pascal in an '*abstraction scandalisante*;' that the point of them was blunted by restrictions and conditions; that confessors knew what was meant; that they expressed themselves ill. But when Escobar decides that 'a man may satisfy the Church precept by going to mass, with the intention also of indulging bad thoughts';² or a 'judge receive bribes to pay particular attention to a cause';³ or 'that a man may evade the law of fasting in certain cases, for the reason that no one is bound to alter the order of his meals';⁴ and when Bauny blunders into awkward vagueness about '*occasions prochaines*,'⁵ or says that if a man begs a soldier to beat his neighbour or burn his barn, he is not bound to compensation, because it is not his act—he not having *forced* the soldier to do it, whom nothing obliged but his own *bonté, douceur, facilité*—M. Maynard gives up such decisions, and laughs with Pascal⁶ at the *bonté* and *douceur* of the burner of barns,—'*for there is nothing else to be done*.' But he insists, that from such insignificant authorities no harm could ever come. The obvious answer is, that, whether absurd or not, they were popular. P. Bauny's *Somme des Péchés*, a large book of a thousand pages,⁷ was in a sixth edition. '*A qui la faute, si ce n'est à vous, qui lui avez donné sa célébrité?*' says M. Maynard, when Pascal talks of the many reprints of Escobar; there might possibly be some colour in the rejoinder, if we were not informed, on other authority, that, of the *forty-two* editions of Escobar, *forty-one* appeared *before*, and *one after*, the date of the *Provinciales*.⁸

¹ Vol. i. p. 284. ² Vol. i. p. 437. ³ Vol. i. pp. 353, 351. ⁴ Vol. i. p. 231.

⁵ Vol. i. p. 236. ⁶ Vol. i. p. 367. ⁷ Vol. i. p. 293.

⁸ 'La cherté ou du moins la curiosité s'y mit en effet. Escobar avait été imprimé quarante-et-une fois avant 1656: il le fut une quarante-deuxième fois en 1656, grâce aux Provinciales.'—Ste. Beuve, vol. iii. p. 52. Hallam, vol. ii. p. 500, speaks of forty editions, and gives the date 1646.

But even Escobar and Bauny M. Maynard is loth to resign to the cruelties of Pascal. 'Mon Dieu!' he cries, 'la doctrine de Bauny fut-elle si relâchée,'¹ that Pascal should risk the honour of the priesthood by revealing his eccentric decisions to the world? '*Nous avons pitié de ce pauvre père Bauny, si maltraité par Pascal, et qu'à notre grand regret nous serons obligé de condamner nous-mêmes en d'autres circonstances.*' So of Escobar, he draws a touching, and possibly a true picture, as a man of boundless and not very accurate labour, undertaken with the kindest intentions, and, like many other good men, perfectly unconscious that, with so much learning, he could say anything ridiculous or mischievous. It is at least a very probable representation. Doubtless Escobar would never have written as he did, but for greater men than Escobar, who set the fashion and showed him the way. Escobar was obviously a man who would never have dreamed of going beyond the spirit or ideas of the atmosphere in which he worked, or the authorities who were his daily and nightly study, and in whom his profound admiration saw a counterpart to the Apocalyptic Vision. If he improved upon them, he had learned from those whom he surpassed the taste for improving on them. He could not understand what harm or what excess there could be in decisions which, in full accordance with a received system, he made in pure charity.² He was astonished, we are told, at his *triste célébrité*. But he is none the worse a representative of what the system of speculating on morality, and that for the practical purposes of the confessional, had been allowed to come to. He showed the use that could be made of the Casuists, as Pascal's conversations show the use that *could be* made of such men as Escobar, (for the *Père Jésuite* of the Letters is a dramatized Escobar,) and, we must add, from the plain historical facts of the period, the use that *was* made of them. And after all, even Escobar is an authority. 'Enfin Saint Liguori cite avec respect *la plupart des Casuistes de Pascal*, et même Escobar, l'homme *aux vingt-quatre vieillards, et aux quatre animaux.*'³

In truth, we must take the liberty of thinking that it is ludicrous to suppose that Escobar would have been allowed to go on writing, and booksellers to go on reprinting, these curious questions and answers, if he had said anything that was so very repugnant to the current notions of those in power in the Order, or in the Church itself. Quite another account would have been given of him if his licences and eccentricities had taken another turn, if he had spoken of the right and sanctions of ecclesiastical precepts, as he did of the *way of satisfying* them;

¹ Vol. i. pp. 284, 285.² Vol. ii. p. 454.³ Vol. i. p. 208.

if he had taken the explanatory liberties with the Pope's divine right he did with the modes of fasting and hearing mass, or had been as vague in his doctrine about transubstantiation as about '*occasions prochaines*.' Writers did not escape the censure, because they were small people. P. Bauny was, in fact, put in the *Index*. As for himself, *ce pauvre Père Bauny*, 'ce bon père, 'si commode, dont on disait, en le voyant, *Ecce qui tollit peccata mundi!*' it must be said that he snapped his fingers at the *Index*: '*Qu'a de commun la censure de Rome avec celle de France?*' a remark which, as M. Maynard informs us, 'tient à 'un principe *Gallican*, que nous n'aimons pas, mais toléré par 'Rome elle-même, que l'*Index* n'oblige pas en France.' But according to M. Maynard's view, it was mainly its Erastianism, not its laxity, that led to its condemnation at Rome:—

'Ici on doit remarquer qu'un livre est quelquefois mis à l'*Index* pour une simple formalité omise dans l'impression, ou bien pour quelque principe peu conforme à certaines maximes des Casuistes d'Italie, par exemple, celui du P. Bauny touchant la juridiction des officiers civils sur les clercs; et il paraît qu'on apporta ce motif pour presser la censure de la Somme des Péchés; ce qui n'empêche pas cependant que cet ouvrage ne soit condamnable à d'autres égards, et ne renferme quelques propositions relâchées qui lui valurent la réprobation des évêques de France.'—Vol. i. p. 148.

This, however, according to M. Maynard, is the state of the fact. The Jesuits held nothing but what the Church holds, and therefore have a right to throw their responsibility on her. But the most important point yet remains. What does he tell us of the standard itself, to which he brings these doctrines? In the Letters, an easy theory of religion is contrasted with a strict one. Does M. Maynard mean that the Jesuit theory could not have been the easy one, because it was that of the Church; or that though it was an easy one, it must be right, because it is that of the Church? We must think that M. Maynard has been more resolute in ascribing the Jesuit doctrines to the Church, than successful in disproving that these doctrines were what are usually accounted easy ones.

It is suspicious at starting to find M. Maynard sympathising so strongly with the devotional works criticised by Pascal. He reminds us that the Jesuits had produced something better. But what appeared to Pascal sentimental trifling in the one, and a substitution of childish superstition to S. Mary for real religion in the other, appears to M. Maynard as the very counterpart of modern piety. If he had retorted on Pascal, in return for the cruel immortalizing of the '*Dévotion Aisée*' and the poet of '*Delphine*,' that, after all, that all his wit had been spent on a poor ordinary theological fop of an age of bad taste, a harmless and smirking hanger-on at tea-tables to find them in divinity and wit, it would have been intelligible, if not fair. Not so,

however, M. Maynard; on taste and theology both, he is at issue with Pascal. P. Le Moine, he thinks, with a little less exuberance of imagination and language, 'might have become a great poet.' He cannot see what he so happily terms, the '*ton musquée et galant*' of Pascal's quotations. The '*Dévotion Aisée*' is *aimable, charmant, délicieux*; its language *ravissant*; its histories like the *doux babil d'un enfant*.¹ When P. Le Moine said, that by the rules of true devotion, virtue had been made '*plus facile que la vice, et plus aisée que la volupté*,' and '*le simple vivre incomparablement plus malaisé que le bien vivre*,' he spoke of the joys of a good conscience, and the pains of vice and ambition. When he sneered at melancholy devotees, who thought of nothing but a dreary asceticism, he only meant Port-Royal. We can only say, that it shows that P. Le Moine and M. Maynard are kindred spirits.

P. Barry's book, '*Le Paradis ouvert à Philagie par cent Dévotions à la Mère de Dieu*,' he gives up, in a literary point of view; but, on the other hand, its spirit, its theology, the devotional practices which it recommends,—some of them, says M. Maynard, of such simplicity, that they make us smile, *esprits forts* that we are, but all authorized by the example of some great saint,—are most edifying. The following shows the principle on which he answers Pascal:—

'Pascal voudrait-il dire que le Père Barry, dans son aveugle confiance, a présenté des pratiques toutes matérielles comme des moyens infaillibles de sanctification, sans qu'il fut nécessaire d'y joindre le *plus petit mouvement* de cœur, le *moindre effort* de la volonté? Il l'insinue méchamment; mais c'est une calomnie. "*Donnez tout le cœur à la Mère d'amour*, dit Barry, avec protestation qu'aucune créature ne le possédera." Et que fait-il autre chose en tout

¹ 'Le livre de la *Dévotion Aisée*, du Père Le Moine, est une aimable et charmant petit livre; après les ouvrages de Saint François de Sales, nous n'en connaissons pas de plus délicieux, ni de plus encourageant pour la faiblesse humaine. Aussi ce livre fût-il parfaitement accueilli; et dès son apparition, le goût public lui fit une célébrité. Le Père Le Moine n'était pas seulement un saint religieux, mais un homme d'esprit, et un homme du monde. Il parlait à ceux qu'il voulait amener à la pratique de la dévotion, le seul langage qu'il convint de leur tenir. Ce langage fut entendu, le petit livre fut dévoré sans que personne se sentit du poison qu'il contenait; le Jansénisme fut jaloux de ce succès. La facilité de cette dévotion ne consiste pas à lui allier des choses coupables ou dangereuses, mais à montrer qu'elle peut s'unir à toutes les conditions honnêtes de la vie, et qu'elle n'est pas incompatible avec les joies et les plaisirs qu'avoue la vertu... *que la religion n'est pas essentiellement cette Thébaïde, ces terreurs, ces desespoirs que rêvait le Jansénisme*, mais que si quelques-uns sont appelés à cette sombre perfection, les autres peuvent le sanctifier dans des conditions communes. Pouvait-on dire autre chose aux gens de monde! et ce langage, n'est-il pas plus propre à faire des Chrétiens que la morale alambiquée dans St. Cyran?... Pour nous, nous aimons ce petit livre, et parcequ'il peut faire du bien à beaucoup d'âmes, et parcequ'il est un véritable curiosité littéraire; nous aimons ces histoires naïves qui ressemblent au doux babil d'un enfant s'entretenant avec son père, et nous ne songeons pas à jeter une pédante critique au-devant de notre admiration... Nous plaignions les esprits revêches et farouches de Port-Royal, de n'avoir pu goûter ce qui nous paraît si charmant et si gracieux.'—Vol. I. pp. 395—404.

son livre, sinon inviter Philagie à consacrer à Marie toutes ses puissances intérieures? Et dans l'endroit même où Pascal est allé chercher *ce petit esclave* si attaché aux créatures, Barry s'écrie: "Donnez-lui votre cœur sans partage, tel qu'il est, et dites-lui ce peu de paroles: 'Suit une consécration à la Ste Vierge, où le cœur est donné sans réserve et avec une effusion charmante.'"—Vol. i. p. 391.

Undoubtedly Père Barry recommends us to consecrate our whole heart to S. Mary,—in words, it may be observed, than which no other can be imagined to express devotion of ourselves to God; but this is no disproof of Pascal's charge, that in default of this consecration, something as short of it as saluting her image, or pronouncing her name, will avail. Père Binet's little book is, it seems, quite an anticipation of modern ideas and feelings:—

'At the moment when the arduous and overwhelming questions of predestination were agitated in the theological world, the Père Binet thought, with reason, that he would do better to leave on one side all these disputes, in which we may lose faith without ever deriving from them a virtue, in order to point out the practical means of arriving at eternal salvation; and he composed his book, entitled *Marque de Prédestination*, which he dedicated to Cardinal Bellarmine. Among all the means of salvation he chose the devotion to the holy Virgin. *This book seems to have been written for our age, and to contain a sort of prophecy of the wonders which we have seen accomplished in our days by the devotion to Mary.* "When all the world was lost," says Binet, in his first page, "God sent Mary on the earth, and by her He gave us Jesus Christ, the author of all our good. Now that all the world seems rushing to its ruin, nothing can assure us so much as *that the devotion of this worthy Mother of God should begin to flourish again in the Church, and that by her intercession God should be favourable to us, and inflame our hearts again.*" All this, it appears, did not please Port-Royal, which preferred plunging into the abysses of grace and predestination rather than simply committing itself to the hands of Mary. Port-Royal did not openly condemn the devotion to the holy Virgin, but as this has something affectionate and tender, which suited not with its doctrines, it preferred a terror, a trembling before God. Consequently, *with reference to certain books which spoke of the worship of the holy Virgin, as we all speak of it, we Christians in 1851, Port-Royal set itself to ridicule certain simple practices*, not seeing that impiety would gather up its sarcasms, to turn them against all devotion. Port-Royal it is which has torn from us that simple confidence, that childhood of faith, those sweet tears of prayer, which are to our critical minds and dried-up hearts, but a charming recollection, when they are not an object of ridicule. We have read Père Binet's little book, and without blushing we confess that it has interested us. To prove his thesis, that the devotion to the holy Virgin is a great mark of predestination, he goes through all the figures of the Bible, all the passages of sacred literature and of the Fathers, where there is allusion to the greatness, powers, and the mercies of Mary. He develops especially that thought, familiar to S. Bernard, that God has given us everything by her, and that this order is henceforth unchangeable; that she is our advocate and our patroness, and that her true servants cannot perish.'—Vol. i. pp. 391—393.

Whether there are not differences between what is childlike and what is childish in religion; whether it matters or not *how*, and *on what object*, the religious affections are exercised, so that

they *are* exercised; whether it be right or not to encourage religious practices and belief by what is apocryphal, must still remain questions while the divisions of Christendom remain. But it can be no question whether what Pascal, as a Roman Catholic, repudiates as a degrading self-deceit, M. Maynard, as a Roman Catholic, accepts both as beautiful in spirit, and as the acknowledged devotional idea of his own time.

From worship and devotion, let us go to practice. The following is an incidental sketch, by one who had good means of observing, of the religion of the day in the time of Louis XIV. It seems to be the echo of Pascal's interpretation of the '*Dévotion Aisée*,' and the '*Paradis Ouvert*,' as opening to the world, '*des moyens d'assurer son salut, assez faciles, assez sûr, et en assez grand nombre.*'

'J'ai appris avec beaucoup de plaisir que M. le Comte de Gramont a recouvré sa première santé, et acquis une dévotion nouvelle. Jusqu'ici, je me suis contenté grossièrement d'être homme de bien; il faut faire quelque chose de plus; et je n'attends que votre exemple pour être dévot. *Vous vivez dans un pays où l'on a de merveilleux avantages pour se sauver. Le vice n'y est guère moins opposé à la mode qu'à la vertu. Pécher, c'est ne savoir pas vivre, et choquer la bienséance autant que la religion.* Ceux qui n'ont pas assez de considération pour l'autre vie sont conduits au salut par les égards et les devoirs de celle-ci. C'en est assez sur une matière où la conversion de M. de Gramont en a engagé: je la crois sincère et honnête. Il sied bien à un homme qui n'est pas jeune d'oublier qu'il l'a été.'

The passage is from a letter to the notorious Ninon de l'Enclos, from S. Evremond, the old favourite of Ninon and of Marion Delorme, the master of gay and easy philosophy in the court of Charles II., and of whom, in proof, we must observe, of his religion, his biographer¹ writes, that 'though very worldly in his morality, he had always held it as a principle to respect religion, and made outward profession of the Catholic faith. He would never allow it to be turned into a matter of plea-santry.'²

Whatever doubt there may be as to the meaning of making

¹ Biog. Univ.—'S. Evremond.'

² 'La seule bienséance,' he said, 'et le respect qu'on doit à ses concitoyens, ne le permettait pas.' The writer quotes the passage we have given, as a proof of his religion, and proceeds to add, that if we could have any doubts 'on the subject of his religion, his will would dispel them, in which he "implores the mercy of God," and leaves a pious legacy for poor Catholics;' and then cites the following verses of S. Evremond on himself:—

'De justice et de charité,
Beaucoup plus que de pénitence,
Il compose sa piété.

'Mettant en Dieu sa confiance,
Espérant tout de sa bonté,
Dans le sein de la Providence
Il trouve son repos et sa félicité.'

'la dévotion plus facile que le vice, et plus aisée que la volupté,' in the mouth of a priest, there can be little—whether it be irony or earnest—about its meaning in the mouth of a wit. Yet when M. Maynard wants to convey what he considers a just and true view of religious strictness, in contrast to the rigour and Puritanism of Port-Royal, he goes to seek it in a dialogue between S. Evremond and one of his friends:—

'Elles font,'—says D'Aubigny to S. Evremond, in the conversation between them in St. Evremond's works, speaking of the doctrines of Port-Royal,—*'Elles font une violence éternelle à la nature; elles ôtent de la religion ce qui nous console; elles y mettent la crainte, la douleur, le désespoir. Les Jansénistes, voulant faire des saints de tous les hommes, n'en trouvent pas dix dans un royaume, pour faire des Chrétiens tels qu'ils les veulent. Le Christianisme est divin, mais ce sont des hommes qui le reçoivent; et quoi qu'on fasse, il faut s'accommoder à l'humanité. Une philosophie trop austère fait peu de sage; une politique trop rigoureuse peu de bons sujets; une religion trop dure, peu d'âmes religieuses qui le soient long temps. Rien n'est durable, qui ne s'accommode à la nature. La grâce dont nous parlons tant, s'y accommode elle-même; Dieu se sert de la docilité de notre esprit, et de la tendresse de notre cœur, pour se faire recevoir et se faire aimer. Il est certain que les docteurs trop rigides donnent plus d'aversion pour eux que pour les péchés. La pénitence qu'ils prêchent fait préférer la facilité qu'il y a de demeurer dans le vice, aux difficultés qu'il y a d'en sortir.'*—Vol. i. p. 202.

Here is a man of the world's view of religion, and the wisdom of this world speaks in it. It was, no doubt, the view of the Court of Louis XIV. M. Maynard offers it as the view of the Church. It is a strange way of expressing the indulgence and condescension of religion. This, says M. Maynard, the Jansenists ignored; and we believe that it is partly true. But if the Jansenists, in reviving the old ideas about penitence, forgot that the Gospel had an indulgent side, those whom they opposed seem to have forgotten that it has a stern one; and what is more, M. Maynard, at this day, in his defence of them, forgets it too. If the Jansenists spoke to all the world the same language, and bound weak as well as strong to counsels of perfection, most assuredly the Casuists spoke as if the mass of Christians were dispensed from all but the veriest shadows of religion, and as if it were necessary to the success of religion that the 'gate' should be declared to be *not* 'strait,' and the 'way' not 'narrow.' And the theologian of the nineteenth century tells us that they were right.

Let us take first M. Maynard's view of perhaps the most prominent feature of the Roman practical system—their system of penitence.

The great feature of the Port-Royalist directors was, that penitence to be effectual must be real and searching; and that the sacraments without this effectual penitence availed nothing.

Here M. Maynard sees the root of their error. In opposition to it he thus states the Jesuit principle:—

‘Understanding a little better the redemption of love, the admirable economy of the Sacraments, those sacred channels which place us in communication with the source of divine graces, *the Jesuits urged men to the participation of the divine mysteries, with the same ardour as the Jansenists displayed in turning them away.* They were convinced with the Church, that nowhere else was there succour for the weakness, or medicine for the wounds of the soul. Jansenism abandoned man to his own resources, while it looked on his faculties as annihilated by sin. The Jesuits, more consistent, bade him walk with God, and borrow continually from the treasures prepared by God’s mercy, the supply needed by his own powers, weakened indeed, but not destroyed. Men, gifted at once with a practical sense of life, and with a boundless charity, on the one hand *they dreamed not of a chimerical perfection, and thought not of transforming the world into a Thebaid, and driving all Christians into the desert:* and on the other, they repelled no one, offering themselves to heal the deepest wounds of the soul, as well as its ailments and its weaknesses, making themselves “all things to all men,” like S. Paul, and feeling themselves obliged to continue the ministry of the Master, who came not to call the righteous, but sinners.’

‘Persuaded that the sinner, if no one holds out a hand, will plunge deeper and deeper into vice, and fall soon into an irrecoverable impenitence, they were eager to snatch him from evil, to interrupt, at least, his sinful habits, to give him, by some act of virtue, a taste of the virtue which he knows not. They did not demand, for admission to reconciliation, those interior dispositions, which even the most perfect do not always attain, and which, consequently, are to him well nigh impossible, in his state of sin and disfavour with God; but only that he should actually place no obstacle in the way of the effect of the Sacrament, whatever might be his future miserable falls, (*quelles que dussent être ses misères futures;*) and they left to grace the care of fortifying his weakness, of rendering his backslidings, at first less frequent, then rare, till he should arrive in due time at a perfect conversion, and the sinner become a saint.’

‘It was possible to abuse this charitable tolerance; who doubts it? Men might sometimes find in the facility of pardon an encouragement to vice; who denies it? But the evil was the exception in this system of direction, while it was the good which was the exception in that of the Jansenists. *For one sinner who changed the divine remedy into poison, a thousand found in recovery and life; for one sinner who would consent to follow the long and painful way opened by Jansenism to reconciliation, a thousand refused to take the first step, and excusing themselves on the ground of the impossibility of virtue, fixed their permanent abode in vice, or fell into despair.*’

‘It is not necessary to be a theologian, nor even a Christian, to understand that: it is enough to be a man, and therefore, we leave with confidence to *men of the world* who may read us, the business of pronouncing between Jansenius and Loyola.’

The appeal to men of the world on a question of strictness of direction is curious. But we would not have M. Maynard too sure of their verdict. They admire strictness, in theory, at least; and they might, moreover, be apt to think that, if confession and penance cannot be worked on a large scale strictly and really, without driving the masses from the altar, or to hang themselves, they may be dispensed with on a large scale altogether. And what, in fact, was the case in that seventeenth

century, when the 'Jesuits had the monopoly of direction, which they held exclusively of the public confidence?'¹ M. Maynard asks, indeed, 'Does any one believe that morals were 'more relaxed at the time when Probabilism was the doctrine 'of nearly all the schools, than in our own, when we hypocritically protest against it?'²—'Quant aux hommes de bien, 'qu'importe un système spéculatif? . . . Nous concluons donc 'hardiment que ces systèmes de morale, dont on peut éternellement disputer, n'ont aucune influence sérieuse sur la conduite 'de la vie.' But it is he who tells us this was such an epoch of licentiousness and impiety, that it is a fair argument against the reality of the feeling raised by Pascal on the subject of the bad maxims, 'that there was not sufficient moral sense left to be really revolted by them.'³ If the fact were not notorious, we should learn even from him of the steady progress of irreligion throughout the seventeenth century—of Père Mersenne's⁴ calculation of the number of atheists in 1623,—60,000 in France, 50,000 in Paris, 12 in a single house; of the 'hypocritical reserves which the severe and morose piety of' the great pupil of the Jesuits, 'Louis XIV., as he grew old, imposed on profligacy;' and how to these 'hypocritical reserves,' and this 'severe and morose piety,' succeeded the days of the Regent Orleans and Louis XV.—days of blasphemy and abomination, probably never equalled since the world was made. We must add, however, that he lays this to the account of the Provincial Letters!

Such is the broad principle on which the Jesuit system of direction is defended. To make penitence a work which may alarm the half-hearted, is not only sneered at as '*transforming the world into a Thebaid*,' but plainly stated to be an intentional blow at religion; and to urge on men in general the moral discipline of religion, is to deny the grace, and abolish the use of the Sacraments—to 'abandon man to his own resources.' Indeed, as to what was, *in fact*, the Jesuit principle, there is little difference between Pascal and M. Maynard.⁵

¹ Vol. i. p. 34.

² Vol. i. p. 200.

³ Vol. i. p. 203.

⁴ Vol. i. p. 61.

⁵ 'Take away,' he says, 'from the following statement, the exaggeration, the tone of irony, the spiteful insinuations, and you will have in fact the principle of the Jesuits in the conduct of souls,—the principle which he tells us is the principle of the Church. 'Alas!' says the *bon père*, in the Sixth Provinciale,—'alas! it would have been our first object to establish no maxims but those of the Gospel in all their strictness: and it may be seen sufficiently by the regularity of our own morals, that if we suffer some laxity in others, it is rather by condescension than by design. We are forced to it. Men are now so corrupt, that since we cannot make them come to us, we must go to them; otherwise they would leave us: they would do worse, they would give themselves up altogether. And it is to keep hold on them that our Casuists have taken into consideration the vices to which men

Accordingly the Jesuits' great boast was that they had made confession popular by their system. They had won back to the Roman Church that *prestige* of popular religion which for a time the Reformation had claimed. 'We are overwhelmed,' they say in the *Imago Primi Sæculi*,—*obruimur*,—'by the number of penitents.' With a confidence only equalled by Luther's *Peccata fortiter*, and equally likely to be misunderstood, they protest that—singular change in this sinful world of ours!—men had become more eager to confess than to commit sin, '*Alacrius multo atque ardentius scelera jam expiantur quam ante solebant committi*.' Nothing was more common, '*nil magis moribus receptum*,' than monthly or weekly confession. Many '*no sooner contract a stain than they wash it out*.' Here is an account, indeed, of a popular religion, which M. Maynard does not except to—'*les jeunes Jésuites vantent avec raison*,'—though he charges Pascal, as usual, with '*falsifying*' it, not because he misquotes it, but because he supplies the reason of it.

But how was this brought about? What was that '*pietatis sollertia*,' that '*religiosa calliditas*,' of which the Jesuits boasted? '*Pieuses et saintes finesses*,' '*artifices de dévotion*,' '*adoucissements de confession*;'—these are Pascal's interpretations. 'Admirables paroles!' on the contrary, says M. Maynard, '*qui n'expriment pas d'autres subtilités, ou d'autres finesses que celles de Jésus-Christ même*.' What Pascal denounces, as irreligious, M. Maynard accepts as necessary and Catholic. Thus the Jesuit authorities cited by Pascal seem only intent on removing every obstacle to the facility of absolution. M. Maynard quarrels with Pascal's use of the passages; he says, what is true, that Filiuci and his brethren say something besides this; but still, that they do say this, he allows, and justifies it. A man, he says, kneels down, confesses with shame his faults; says that he is sorry for them; that he has a firm resolution of not committing them again; on the other hand, he is not in any '*occasion prochaine*,' and *nothing proves that he has any affection for sin*. Why not believe him, and absolve him? *You have believed his confession, why not believe his promises*. '*Disons enfin, que dans la pratique on est souvent obligé d'en agir ainsi*. Pascal pouvait l'ignorer; mais les prêtres d'expérience, les missionnaires surtout, le savent bien.' (ii. 19.) So, again, Suarez and Filiuci are quoted as saying:—

are most inclined in all conditions of life, in order to establish maxims so mild, without at the same time doing violence to truth, that persons must be hard to please if they are not satisfied with them; for the leading design which our Society has in view for the good of religion, is not to repel any one, whoever he may be, in order not to drive the world to despair.'

'That "the priest is obliged to believe his penitent on his word," and, "that it is not necessary that the confessor should persuade himself that the resolution of his penitent will be fulfilled, nor that he himself judge that it probably will; but it is enough that he think that he has at the moment the intention in general, though he may relapse in a very short time." And it is thus that all our authors teach: *Ita docent omnes auctores.*'

On which the comment is:—

'It is, alas! but too certain that the confessor must often act thus, under the alternative of reconciling sinners but rarely, and leaving them to besot themselves in their vicious habits. But, by the grace of absolution (which is supposed to be always given, in cases of sufficient disposition), relapses will soon become less frequent, and the conversion finish by being complete.'

Even the startling sentiment, that 'absolution may be given to him who avows that the hope of being absolved had led him to sin with more ease than if he had not had the hope,' is thus explained:—

'*Encore Bauny! que c'est ennuyeux!* These quotations are made up of passages taken from right and left, at the interval of several folio columns. *N'importe, c'est à peu près cela.* Only Bauny adds: So that the penitent, affected with necessary sorrow, brings to confession the plan of living better: "ce qui ne veut pas dire pourtant, nous l'avouons, qu'il ne soit un peu relâché." But it is not less true, that absolution frequently repeated, will often be the only mode of rescuing a sinner from vicious habits. *The friends of God* are much stronger than his foes against their passions. The return to grace is itself a first victory, which will soon lead to a decisive triumph. There may be exceptions to this rule, this is unquestionable; but all must be left to the prudence of the confessor.'—Vol. ii. pp. 22, 23.

A curious light, this, thrown incidentally on the actual working of one of the seemingly strictest parts of the Roman system. We shall understand this better, when we examine M. Maynard's way of dealing with the subject of contrition and the love of God. Pascal quotes from P. Pinthereau the sentiment that 'all the Jesuit fathers teach, with one consent, that it is an error, and almost a heresy, to say that contrition is necessary, and that attrition alone, even conceived by the mere dread of the pains of hell, but excluding the will to sin, is not sufficient with the sacrament of absolution. The pithy comment on this is, 'C'est vrai.' 'What, almost an article of faith!' cries Pascal; 'every one else has required at least some love of God to be mixed with this "attrition."' 'P. Pinthereau,' says the comment, 'does not deny it; but still this will be short of contrition.'

What is *contrition*, then, that a Christian may do without it be justified? What degree of sanctity is it that makes it *re than necessary* for men in general? It is sorrow for sin,

¹ Vol. ii. pp. 27, 28.

which is distinguished from the lower form of *attrition*, by proceeding from, and being joined with, a true and hearty love of God. This true and hearty love of God may vary in degree; but where it exists in any real sense, there is contrition.¹ Attrition is the sorrow which springs from the fear of punishment, a disgust at sin, and though mixed with an 'inchoate love,' it is distinctly said to want real *charity*, or love of God. And the approved Roman doctrine is, we are informed, that a man whose sole motive for being sorry for his sins is the fear of their punishment, and who has nothing but the *motion* to love God, but no true love of Him, *requires* no other frame of mind to fit him for pardon, but is, when he receives the sacrament of Absolution, actually and truly forgiven and justified. The doctrine is, not that he is in *the way*, or may *hope* to be forgiven—it is, that he *is* forgiven; justification is given him, not in promise or foretaste, but in actual possession.

'It is certain that attrition suffices with the Sacrament for the justification of the sinner. Theologians were still disputing on this point at the end of the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent not having decided anything. But the Jansenist doctrine on the *necessity* of contrition justifying by itself, drew afresh the attention of theologians to this important question; and at this day, *it would be almost a heresy*, as P. Pinthereau said, to maintain the insufficiency of attrition, even arising from the sole motive of the pains of hell, provided that it be accompanied by a beginning of love of God, considered as the source of all justice.'—Vol. ii. p. 29.

The reason assigned for this doctrine is a remarkable one. It is, according to Liguori, that contrition, *loving* sorrow, justifies of itself, *without* and *before* the sacrament of Absolution;²

¹ Contrition is defined by the Council of Trent, as '*Animi dolor ac detestatio de peccato commisso, cum proposito non peccandi de cætero*,' and stated to be a necessary part of the sacrament of Penance. But the later theologians, *e.g.* Liguori, hold that the word is a *generic* one, and comprehends, 1. *Perfect contrition*, which arises '*ex motivo charitatis*,' 2. *Imperfect contrition*, which is called *attrition*, 'which is conceived either from a view of the foulness of sin, or the fear of hell, excluding the will to sin, and including the hope of pardon,' but having only '*amor inchoatus*,' which is different in kind, not only in degree, from the *true love of God*, '*charitas prædominans*,' which, whether more or less intensely, loves God above the creature. '*Nos non negamus requiri in attritione initium amoris, sed dicimus tantum non requiri charitatem prædominantem.*'—Liguori, *Hom. Apost. Tr.* xvi. c. 2. No. 8, 14.

² '*Sacramenta actualiter operantur quod significant; unde verificari debet (ex se loquendo) quod cum sacerdos dat absolutionem, eo momento peccata remittuntur. . . Si ergo in dolore necessario requiritur charitas prædominans, sacramentum nunquam causaret gratiam, quia omnes accederent jam justificati; nam quilibet dolor qui ex charitate prædominante procedit est vera contritio, ut docet S. Thomas; et hoc accidit quoties homini displicet potius gratiæ quam alterius boni amissio; et cum illa sit vera contritio, quamvis exiguus sit dolor, delet peccata. . . .*' '*Omniem culpam delet*,' says S. Thomas; and again, '*Per solam contritionem dimittitur peccatum, . . . si antequam absolvetur habeat hoc sacramentum in voto, jam virtus clavium operatur in ipso.*' The love of God spoken of in Scripture cannot, in its lowest degree, be joined with sin; and in its lowest degree is different from that '*beginning of it*' which may be with attrition. '*Si autem in attritione desidera-*

and that, therefore, as the sacrament does also of itself justify, it must require, as a previous disposition, *something less* than is sufficient to justify independently of it. If contrition, which implies charity, were necessary, the sacrament would never cause grace, or justify; for the simple reason, that those who came fitly to it, would come already justified. Contrition, he says, is a 'formal act of charity,' which loves God above all things, and which, therefore, according to innumerable passages of Scripture, cannot be joined with sin; 'since, therefore, it is 'certain that the love which loves God above all things, whatever 'it be in degree, (*charitatem prædominantem quamvis remissam*,) 'cannot be joined with sin, it is certain that any sort of contrition, being formally an act of charity, takes away sins.' There would, therefore, be no room left for the proper and real office of the sacrament in justifying, if we suppose that it required a disposition of such intrinsic efficacy as contrition. And M. Maynard does not shrink from the Jesuit's startling conclusion, quoted by Pascal as the *ne plus ultra* of nonsense and laxity joined. 'Que la contrition n'est point du tout nécessaire pour obtenir l'effet principal du Sacrement (*i.e.* justification), mais au contraire, elle y est plutôt un obstacle: "imo 'obstat potius quominus effectus sequatur.'"¹

The doctrine, too, is a curious case of a doctrine developing from a vagueness which gave an advantage to the stricter interpretation, to a clearness which took it away. The process, as given in Liguori, may be compared with Pascal's account of the growth of probable opinions.² A General Council left things in doubt; a Pope, while forbidding either side to censure or insult the other, dropped the admission that the opinion of one was the common opinion of the schools. A moral theologian whom the Church has canonized drew the inference, that since the Pope

retur amor inchoatus, qui sit principium amoris . . . hoc non negatur, et dicimus hoc initium jam in qualibet attritione reperiri, tum metu poenarum a Deo infligendum, ("Timor dei initium dilectionis,") tum spe remissionis et beatitudinis.' But a 'verus charitatis prædominantis actus' is not necessary. Of course, even with contrition, the 'will to fulfil all righteousness,' involves the desire of the sacrament.—*Liguori, Hom. Ap. Tr. xvi. c. 2. No. 16.*

¹ To which the comment is, 'C'est très vrai, puisqu'alors le pécheur est déjà justifié, que le Sacrement n'a plus rien à faire sous ce rapport principal, et qu'il ne peut en augmenter la grâce sanctifiante.' Accordingly, he charges the Jansenists with 'destroying the use' of the Sacrament, for saying that the *absolution of the priest is real, only when it follows the sentence of the invisible Judge*, and requiring in consequence great preparation; 'Nous y voilà,' says he, when Pascal charges the Jesuits with giving absolution indifferently to all who ask for it, without first considering whether Jesus Christ unlooses in heaven those whom they unloose on earth; 'Nous y voilà; Jésus-Christ doit d'abord délier dans le ciel avant que le prêtre ne délie sur la terre.' Here is the secret let out of the Jansenist plan. 'In a case the priest's office was useless, for the sinner was already purified before'—Vol. ii. pp. 3—17.

² Roy. VI. 'D'abord, le docteur grave qui l'a inventée l'expose au monde,' &c.

had attested that this *was* the common opinion of the schools, it had become the *morally certain* one, and therefore the opposite the *improbable* one, which no doctor may embrace. 'The Pope's decree,' he remarks, 'does not forbid the opposite opinion to be called *improbable*; for improbability is not a note of censuring or contumely forbidden by the decree.' And, at last, the public is informed by dignified ecclesiastics, as a matter of notoriety, that it has become 'presque une hérésie' to hold it.¹

Nor is this a mere question of the schools. So practical a question is it, that M. Maynard, with Père Pinthereau, can see no mercy or advantage in the Gospel, if contrition is made identical with saving penitence, and sinners are to be told that justification cannot be had without it:—

'C'est le couronnement de cette doctrine,' says the *bon père*. 'Vous y verrez donc que cette dispense de l'obligation *fâcheuse* d'aimer Dieu est le privilège de la loi évangélique par-dessus la judaïque. "Il a été raisonnable, dit-il, que, dans la loi de grâce du N. T., Dieu levât l'obligation *fâcheuse* et difficile, qui était dans la loi de rigueur, d'exercer un acte de parfaite contrition pour être justifié: et qu'il instituât des sacrements qui pussent suppléer son défaut, à l'aide d'une disposition plus facile. Autrement, certes, les enfants (les Chrétiens) n'auraient pas maintenant plus de facilité de se remettre aux bonnes grâces de leur Père, qu'avaient jadis ces esclaves (les Juifs), d'obtenir miséricorde de leur Seigneur." '—Lett. X.

M. Maynard corrects Pascal, and corrects him as follows:—

'It is not the obligation of loving God that Father Pinthereau treats as "painful," (*fâcheuse*), but the necessity of a perfect contrition in order to be justified. And it is certain that this act [we have seen how Liguori defines it] is so sublime, so difficult to degraded man, plunged in sensuality, that the sinner would have reason to tremble if he had no other means of reconciliation. Yes, the divine economy of the sacraments is one of the most admirable parts of the New Law, one of its great excellences, compared with the law of severity and fear. The sinner, who could never

¹ 'Sed sententia satis communis, quam nos sequimur, tenet sufficere attritionem sine charitate prædominante, quæ oritur ex timore inferni, aut gloriæ amissione, aut ex horrore erga peccati turpitudinem, lumine fidei cognitam: ita tenent Gonet, Canus, Petroc., Tourn., Cabass., Wigandt, Abelly, Navarr., Suar., Tolet., Lugo, Laym., Salmer, et alii multi, cum Bened. XIV. qui asserit quod *post Tridentum*, cum plausu hanc sententiam omnes scholæ sibi adoptarunt; unde recte dicunt Suar. Less., Castr., Filliuc., Carden., Rainaud., Lugo, Prado, Tanner, Viva et Croix, hanc sententiam *hodie post concilium esse moraliter certam, et oppositam non esse amplius probabilem*. Et quod scholæ, saltem communius, tanquam moraliter certam habeant, constat ex decr. Alex. VII. (5 Maii, 1667,) ubi sub excommunicatione prohibuit, "ne quis audeat alicujus theologice censure alteriusque injuriæ aut contumeliæ notâ taxare alterutram sententiam, sive negantem necessitatem aliqualem dilectionis Dei in attritione ex metu gehennæ conceptâ, quæ hodie inter scholasticos communis videtur, sive asserentem dictæ dilectionis necessitatem." Attestando ergo Pontifex sententiam negantem esse communiorem inter scholasticos, consequenter testatur in scholis haberi communiter certam; dum quisque scit, quod circa sacramentorum valorem alias sententias quam moraliter certas, non posse doctores amplecti. Nec præfato decr. vetuit Pontifex, sententiam oppositam posse nuncupari *improbabilem*; nam improbabilitas non est nota censuræ aut contumeliæ per decretum vetita; especially as we do not deny the necessity of an 'initium amoris.'—Liguori, *Hom. Ap. Tr.* xvi. c. 2. No. 14.

assure himself on the worth of his personal acts, raises himself in perfect security, at this word of the priest, "Go in peace, thy sins are forgiven thee."—Vol. ii. p. 41.

The last part of the letter on the love of God, reads as if it were a caricature. It seems as if, to show the radically false principle of the popular casuistry, Pascal said, Apply the plan of weighing and measuring moral obligation, of fixing the minimum which is safe for conscience, and with which absolution may be granted, of construing rules relating to conscience by the maxim of law, that penal enactments must be interpreted strictly—'*odiosa sunt restringenda et rigore applicanda*'—of finding out what is the *least* amount of morality and religion which is compatible with a state of grace and assurance of justification—apply this to the '*great commandment*,' the obligation to love God 'with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength.' If you are consistent, you are bound to find a minimum here; you are bound to answer the question,—What is enough to satisfy the obligation which the gospel makes indispensable? On your system, men will come to you, as directors of conscience, as those who translate into practical and feasible reality the general principles of duty, as confessors who can refuse absolution if the measure of duty has not been fulfilled, and ask you, What are we bound to? not in a vague indefinite way, but in detail and fact; and you must be able to tell them with certainty or probability, so as to assure their conscience: and the weak will come as well as the strong. On your pretension, of undertaking to entertain and satisfy all questions definitely, as to how much of obedience is necessary and safe, you must be prepared for questions, as to how often, and when, God is to be loved by Christians who wish for justification and salvation. You must not be content, as preachers, with general exhortations to love to the uttermost; you must, as practical moralists, gravely weigh, discuss, limit, and define—define, too, with practical certainty, for it is a matter for practice, and the love of God is one which concerns consciences very seriously,—what is the least that a man may be allowed to love God. And then Pascal might be imagined going on, with the exaggeration of a *reductio ad absurdum*, to represent the great lights of casuistry, meeting and determining exactly what God intended when He bade men love Him with all their heart—some opining for more, some for less, but all *fixing* the measure, and all, whether they fixed it at once in *three* or once in *five* years, allowing to their colleagues' opinion the benefit of probability, however confident they might be of their own; all forced by a supposed consistency to treat the most transcendent law of religious affection in the fashion of bidders at a Dutch auction.

But it is no caricature. The authorities and decisions which he quotes are real ones. The Casuists *have* found it necessary to settle, whether God *must* be loved once, or three times, or eight times in a Christian's life; Escobar gravely pronounces in favour of the moderate Henriquez, who strikes the mean between the excess of Azor, who is for *eight* times, and the defect of Sanchez, who is for *one*, and prescribes, himself, *three*—the age of discretion, the hour of death, and once every five years. It is necessary to distinguish between cases where the obligation to love God is essential, and where accidental. Vasquez and Suarez have really pondered seriously over the problem of *how often*; Castro Palao had as really 'combated them, and with reason, *merito*;' and it is not Pascal but a real Jesuit who represents the most distinguished theologians so puzzled by this question, of how often is *the love of God obligatory*; and so discordant is their solution *when*, that he despairingly takes refuge in the answer,—*Never*.

But if not a caricature, it must, then, of course, we might suppose, be wrong—say, an exploded extravagance, chargeable on the age, or on a perverse love of system, but which it would be unjust to impute to modern theologians. We might the more be led to think this, from finding very similar propositions condemned by Alexander VII. and Innocent XI. And from finding them thus censured, we might have inferred that the Popes meant to discountenance this fashion, whether scientific or practical, of beating down, under the show of *fixing*, the *obligation* of the love of God, as 'at least scandalous.' But we should only have shown our haste and our ignorance of the effect of a censure. M. Maynard, who addresses his refutation of Pascal to the intelligence of the day, is not a whit behind Escobar or Bauny, or the *bon père* himself, in maintaining the good sense and necessity and practical ends of limiting the *obligation* to love God. It is a natural problem in theological science, and necessary information for confessors and their penitents. The Popes have, indeed, condemned *some* ways of limiting it; but it is a mistake to suppose that that has anything to do with *other* ways. The effect of the censure is not to condemn the method of inquiry, but definite wrong answers. From it results the measure up to which, according to the Church, we are bound to exercise love to God. But this measure is a vague one; and though the more definite answers condemned are wrong, other equally definite ones may be right. To the honour of the Jesuits be it said, that *since* the censure, at least, they have never maintained any of *these* propositions. But the *commandment* to love God must be treated like any other precept or obligation—as we treat a civil law, enjoining

or forbidding; it must be construed strictly and against itself; whatever it does not specify, we are not bound to. And here, except within the very wide limits fixed by the Church, we are not bound to any *time*. Obligatory it is, we know; but *when*, and how often, is an open question among theologians; and it is easier to say when it is not, than when it is.

'In the "great commandment" there is the *negative* and *general* precept, which obliges us, under all circumstances, to do nothing against the love of God, and to observe his law; but there is besides, the *affirmative* and *special* one, which obliges us to formal acts of charity. The *affirmative* precept obliges, first *accidentally*, when there is no other way of returning to favour with God, and of itself also, not *always*, but *from time to time* in the course of life.

'It is on the precept of the love of God in this latter view of it, that theologians dispute.

'Now, there are but few points decided about it by the Church. It results, on the one hand, from the censure of certain propositions, that there is obligation to a formal act of love of God, when we have attained the age of reason, (taking this instant in a certain moral latitude,) at the point of death, and several times during life, so that there should not be between each act an interval of five years, nor a culpable delay; and, on the other hand, that this obligation does not exist, as Baius and Jansenius hold, in all the moments and circumstances of life: all the rest is controverted, and will ever be, among theologians. It is especially impossible to assign, besides the two extreme limits of life, the precise and certain moment when the precept obliges.—Vol. ii. pp. 6, 7, *quoting Bossuet*.

And therefore all these Jesuits attacked by Pascal are so far from being wrong or even extravagant, that they say nothing but what is perfectly conformable to Catholic truth and wisdom. 'One only,' le père Antoine Sirmond, who is so puzzled to find when it is ever *necessary* to love God, 'may be abandoned to the passionate justice of Pascal;' and even he, well-meaning man, is more sinned against than sinning. Escobar, too, the 'good old Escobar,' who never dreamt of falling into the hands of a Pascal, and was therefore incautious, vexes M. Maynard with his occasional careless slips; but the rest are blameless.

'Suarez is admirable for his wisdom on this point. After having said that the precept of the love of God obliges "*accidentally*," when a man cannot recur to the sacrament, and has no other means of justification, and, besides, at the point of death, he adds, "that it also obliges sometimes, *of itself*, like every precept; and besides, the love of God is necessary to salvation, only it is difficult to determine the time of the obligation. But the love of God may not be delayed long after the first use of reason; further, it ought to be reiterated sometimes (*quelquefois*) during life; for it is evident that it is not enough for a man to love once or twice in the course of his existence the God for whom he was created, and who is the last end of his actions. But what ought to be this time? It is for prudence to determine it." Vasquez says nothing more than Escobar attributes to him; but he is speaking only of the precept of contrition. Now the two precepts of love of God and contrition being *certainly* connected together only at the hour of death, Vasquez could not determine any other time. Castro Palao does

indeed combat all these opinions; but we must understand him. He also distinguishes the obligation *per se* and *per accidens*. By violating this last, we sin, not against charity, but some other virtue. "*Pure question de mots qui ne change rien à la pratique.*" For the obligation *per se*, it presses from time to time during life, and it is not right to delay long the accomplishment; and, always submitting himself to the judgment of the prudent, he would regard as grave an omission of three years. He thus ends:—"It is rare that a Christian, except he be of depraved morals, makes himself guilty of this crime; for often he endeavours to dispose himself by contrition for the sacrament of Penitence; often he meditates on the benefit of God and his sovereign bounty, the consideration of which incites in him sentiments of charity." *Remarkable words, which show well how all these disputes were purely speculative.*—Vol. ii. pp. 35, 36.

The question, then, is worthy of pious Christians, solemn and laborious theologians, anxious penitents, and practical men. Up to a certain point, the illumination of the Church clears up our doubts as to how often in our lives we *must* love God; but even with the light of these decisions much remains vague. Of course it is a good thing to do so as often as we can. M. Maynard bids us remark that all the Jesuits say so, and that they wrote excellent practical books on the subject; but theologians and confessors require to know not only *when we ought*, but *when we must*. And within the limits fixed for the obligation by the Church, it is a charitable and profitable work to thin out as much as possible the *obligation* of specific occasion, because an *obligation* of the Church involves a definite mortal sin, if neglected. 'The Jesuits,' as M. Maynard remarks, though they, as a general rule, teach all the points decided by the Church, '*refute very well those authors, who, on vain reasons, pretend that the precept of charity obliges of itself on all festival days; when an adult receives baptism—going to martyrdom—at the beginning of some difficult and excellent work—on occasion of signal benefit of God—in temptations to hate him—at the reception of the Eucharist—after a mortal sin, in case that a man cannot or will not have recourse to the sacrament of penitence.*' On these occasions it is purely a question of simple probability, whether we are *bound* to love God; some Jesuits, he observes, say we *are*, on some of them; but as the Church has decided nothing on the subject, we cannot get certainty. Therefore to sift these *pros* and *cons* is an employment worthy to occupy their thoughts, their ingenuity, and their time; and they have come for the most part to admirable conclusions.

Such is M. Maynard's *mentiris impudentissime* to Pascal; and having upset his theology, he answers him as an orator and a man. Pascal is a 'calumniator,' a 'sophist,' a dealer in

¹ Vol. ii. p. 7.

‘false eloquence,’ for contrasting this system with the language of Scripture. ‘The theologians,’ says his refuter, ‘have never dispensed with the love of God, and have spoken only of the time when the rigorous obligation of the precept pressed : voilà la calomnie. The sophistry consists in supposing that the love of God is a thing which may be decreed, and which depends on the theories, more or less subtle, of the schools. *Mais qu’y font ces théories ?* Will men love God more or less, according as this or that decision is found in the *folio* pages of theologians ? *L’amour de Dieu*,’ he continues, *‘s’inspire, et ne se décrète pas.’* Doubtless, ‘decrees’ about affections are strange things : who would think of ‘decreeing’ how many times a-year a son was to love his father, or inquiring how often the obligation of loving her husband was not binding on his wife. But, then, for what purpose were these decisions ? Who did make decrees about the great commandment ? Or does M. Maynard think that Pascal complains because theologians had decided on once in five years instead of once a-week ? ‘*Theories of the Schools*’—‘*pages in folio of theologians*,’—is it M. Maynard who speaks so slightly of labours which he has just presented as so practically necessary and so admirably executed ? Is it he who compares the natural instincts of good sense and good feeling with the weighty maxims of Suarez and Vasquez, and takes refuge from books in the heart ? ‘*L’amour de Dieu ne se décrète pas.*’ We cannot set it up in men’s hearts by theories and decisions. True, M. Maynard, but may it not be explained away by them ?

Now, these belong to a class of subjects in respect to which the Roman Church has been set before us of late in an imposing aspect ; subjects in themselves of permanent interest—the principles and tone of clerical teaching, the depth and seriousness and practical reach of theological doctrines translated into systems at work among men—the discipline of Christian life, amid the passions, the confusions, or the opportunities of the world. In all these matters, great, as we very well know, is the boast of the Roman Catholic Church. She, we have been told, has the most refined and severe principles. She has had living examples of them. She, we are told continually, is uncompromising, consistent, uniform, and she only. This is her boast, and, so far as it is true, her strength. By it her defenders override, with no measured triumph, the theological or historical difficulties of her case. All other bodies, they say, are loose, have no principles, or are afraid of them ; are tame in their moral spirit, compromisers with evil, shrinking from the realities of faith, systematic smoothers of the rough ascent, and wideners of the narrow way. Rome only, besides a clear and unhesitating

theology, has a great system of spiritual discipline of souls and consciences, and a moral character which results from it and corresponds with it; she only has the secret of a searching and elevating ministry—she only dares to realize that she professes. Protestants, on the other hand, proceed the Roman doctors, will have an easy religion. They want a speedy remedy for conscience. They want to be forgiven at once, every time they sin, and to feel assured that they are so; and for this they invented justification by faith. They want to get rid of the reality of repentance. They want to choose their own way of fulfilling their duty. What they rebel against in the Roman Church, is such real aids and obligations to strictness of life as confession and sacramental absolution. Their self-indulgence shrinks from direction, because the two are incompatible. Rome, only, brings the sinner before his God. Rome, only, will not temporise and parley with the self-deceit of the will. Rome, only, secures penitence by acts. She, only, inherits the spirit of the ancient Church—its inexorable hatred of sin. Conscience cannot escape from her strong grasp, and personal questioning. She leaves it without excuse; and shrinks, as from a profanation, from offering it any relief, except what is real. Rome will give a religion of mercy and consolation, but not an easy religion, not a religion of the world.

This is one popular way of presenting the claims of the Roman Church. If Protestants, then, should object to Port-Royal an exaggerated notion of the sacerdotal office, and of the claims and responsibility of the director—if *they* had charged it with giving too real a sanctity to ordinances, and making religion too strict for man—Roman Catholics, it might have been supposed, could have seen nothing but a consistent carrying out of the principles of the Church. When Port-Royal complained so bitterly of playing with the discipline of the confessional, or the ineffable sanctity of the Eucharist, the complaints, to Roman Catholics, would have at least *meaning*. Injudiciously, perhaps, but surely not groundlessly, the Port-Royalists only wanted to take their Church at her word, and to turn the edge of that primitive and Catholic discipline, which cut so deep in controversy with heretics without, against worldliness, and connivance with worldliness, inside the Church. They would seem to be only holding up to the careless multitudes within her pale the standard of religious depth and reality, which her divines presented to their opponents as incapable of accommodating itself to what the world asks for in religion.

But, it seems, they were mistaken. Bossuet thought them in extremes, though he had many points of sympathy with them. But if we are to take such representations as have just been

given, with the air of authority, of the spirit and demands of the Church, their view was radically false. The system which looked so uncompromising and stern in dealing with the individual conscience, when turned towards those without, must wear quite a different aspect when turned to those within;—with whom it is no longer a question about what will best silence them, but about what they can best be got to submit to; In presenting that discipline before them, theologians are, it seems, to remember before what sort of persons it is held up; they are masses of variable character, who look with an evil eye on restraints and inconveniences—a multitude of believers, indeed, but a very mixed one, whose general good will may be trusted, but not to the extent of submitting to any very sharp pressure. Unstable, wayward, halting between right and wrong, it takes but a little to scare or offend them; their worldliness, unruliness, suspiciousness, obstinacy, feebleness, are to be lamented, but, if the Church is to control them, must be allowed for. When speaking of discipline within the Church, the standard is to be set for the weak, the capricious, the self-willed, who form the bulk of actual living mankind. Hold up before *them* the rule of the strong and the perfect, and it is simply driving them from the altar and the confessional.¹ Have, by all means, a high standard besides; have it for the strictly disposed, and keep it for them; but with the multitudes you must be easy, or they will break from you altogether.

We will venture to say that, were he in controversy with an Anglican or a Lutheran, no divine in France would insist more strongly and more feelingly on the austere sanctity of Roman Catholic discipline than M. Maynard. Not Port-Royal itself would be more absolute in statement or inexorable in logic. But he is dealing with domestic difficulties, and with discipline as a system to be realized. In the former case he might have claimed for his communion the maxims of S. Augustin and S. Bernard. In the present, he puts the Jansenist rigorists to confusion by appealing to the indulgent good sense of men of the world, the *mitis sapientia* of the court of Charles II. This may be very sensible; only, what is now the recommendation and boast of the Roman system, when dealing with the necessities of the faint-hearted and petulant multitude within, is, after all, its old taunt against Protestantism—that it is an easy religion.

¹ 'Si l'absolution,' says P. Caussin, 'doit être refusée à ceux que l'espérance d'être absous a portés à pécher avec plus de facilité, l'usage de la confession devra-t-il pas être interdit à la plupart du monde? et il n'y aurait plus d'autre remède aux pécheurs qu'une branche d'arbre et une corde.'—'Le P. Caussin a raison en somme,' observes M. Maynard, vol. ii. p. 24.

Here, then, we observe *another* aspect of the Roman Church ; we do not say that it is not a practical and natural one, but it is *another*. Indeed, the truth is, that in this discussion, our feeling varies, according as we view things broadly or in detail. Look at the discipline of the Church in the gross, and the Jesuits seem to have a good deal to say. They professed to be indulgent, yet watchful and persevering. Look at the special and necessary parts of its machinery, and the way in which it affects theological questions, and Port-Royal seems irresistible. We cannot help allowing the practical common sense of the Jesuit view of mankind, and the way to get hold of them ; but it is equally obvious, that it led them into a most singular maze of theological entanglement, and that the intermediate steps which linked their most unbending dogmatism with the infinite wants and changes of living character, were a series of slippery and prevaricating inventions, without even the poor merit of real subtlety. Keep out of sight what absolution is held to be by the Roman Church, and we think only of the charitable condescension which brings home to the individual penitent the prospect of mercy, and faints not, nor despairs, though ever so often disappointed. But view absolution, not as a subsidiary portion of a great practical machinery for dealing with the waywardness of man, but in itself—as it is defined and zealously exalted in decrees of councils and commentaries of divines, the certain channel of justification—and the condescension seems a strange one, which cheapens such a gift into a mere auxiliary and complement to the most incipient and tentative act of improvement. Yet, it may be said, what were the Jesuits to do ? The Roman Church had strictly defined what absolution was, and to maintain, in its integrity, the Roman dogmatism, was the end and the pride of their institute. On the other hand, in popular practice absolution was inseparably connected with confession, and compensated for its burden. The two things went together, and could not be separated. Their theological duty to Rome led them to extend and enforce to the uttermost the unrestricted and literal interpretation of her language ; their practical duty, to keep up the attachment of the masses to her discipline. They were debarred by the one from restricting the effect of the sacrament ; by the other, from making difficulties in the way of its reception. In their theology, it was all, and even more than all, that any Catholic doctors had made it : in their practice, it must sink to be a solace and encouragement, not to be easily denied even to the lowest and most doubtful class of penitents. To those who objected, they had the practical argument, that nothing less than this *encouragement* would bring men to confess. Absolution, whatever it was, was indis-

tenths of all the sermons on repentance into mere declamation, —we do not say, must be, but certainly *may be*, in the hands of those who choose, logically and consistently, an easy religion; and has extremely little reason to taunt other systems with theories, which make too free with the terms of the Gospel, and yield too speedy a cure to the smarts and impatience of conscience.

From the theological let us proceed to moral explanations. How does M. Maynard deal with the broad fact of Pascal's mass of startling extracts from the popular Casuists? We will state generally the grounds to which he appeals, before we illustrate them by instances. First, he has recourse to the counter charge of false quotation and misconstruction—a very good answer, so far as it is true, but a dangerous one to quibble about; and no other name can be given to a very large proportion of M. Maynard's criticism. He will scarcely ever trust us with a passage quoted in full. He prefers to give what he calls analyses or *exposés* of so and so's doctrine, smooth, guarded, and pointless, which present a far more curious contrast when compared with the downright original, than any of Pascal's unfairnesses. Then, as we have already said, he complains of Pascal's always quoting Escobar and Bauny, which, if Escobar and Bauny spoke only for themselves, might be reasonable; but as they carefully inform us, and the fact is plain on the face of it, that they are servile repeaters of a method which they thought every one accepted, and simply represent the latest results of the labours of others, whose wisdom all admire, it is not so much in place.¹ Then we

¹ The following is Escobar's account of his compilation:—'At ego solummodo memoro reservationem factam ab Agno suis auctoribus Jesuitis . . . Qualibet igitur in materia in primis auctorum Societatis exhaurio, *Medullam Confessoriorum in Examen exponendam*, indicatis generatim auctoribus. Mox circa materias singulas, speciales Doctorum meorum resolutiones ad principiorum generalium praxim attexo, jam specialiter auctorum nomina et scripta citans, jam sola nomina recensens. *Hoc ingenue profiteor, me nihil toto in hoc libello scripsisse, quod Societatis Jesu non acceperim ex Doctore.* Quas enim proprias passim resolutiones innuo, *ex schola Societatis aperte deductas existimari.* Licet autem profiteor totum meum opus ex Societatis Doctoribus texuisse, *non ideo assero omnes sententias omnium esse*, (ut non bene Caramuel intellexit) sed singulas singulis tribuendas, ut aperte ostendo, dum fere nunquam pro una sententia, duos Doctores recenseo. *Dum autem eorum refero dictorum varietatem, non ideo me idem sentire affirmo.* Problematum moralium volumina quæ edidi, quæ digero post unam et alteram contradictoriam relatum sententiam, quid sentiam aperiunt. Porro licet Societati Jesu summula hæc omnem attribuit sententiam, *non ideo indico, propriam esse Societatis, nullam enim propositionem exprimo, quæ non possit gravissimis extra Societatem Doctoribus confirmari.* Quod si sæpe videar me laxioribus opinionibus adhærere, id certe non est definire quid sentio, sed exponere, quid *sine conscientie lesione Docti poterunt cum eis visum fuerit expedire ad sedandos pœnitentium animos, ad praxim adducere.*'

This edition, Lyons, 1659, after the date of the *Provinciales*, has the licence of the Provincial to print the book, (which had been *recognitus* by two fathers of the Society,) for nine years—dated 1644—the approbation of two doctors of theology of

are told that casuistry and moral theology are not popular sciences; that they are a system which cannot be understood, except as a whole; that questions necessarily are very different in the abstract and in practice; that when people have to deal with the infinity of human characters, and sins, and circumstances, the questions which must arise are necessarily intricate and strange; and that we have only to try and state in general terms any set of ordinary practical difficulties, and the ways by which we should ordinarily, in daily life, get through them, to see both how puzzling such subjects are, and how easy to make any *practical* general rules seem grossly lax. Then, it is suggested that we look differently on a crime *before* and *after* it has been committed; that we may forbid most severely, in the abstract, what, when it comes to be realized in a particular person, we do and must judge in a very different way; and that those decisions which shock us so much as they stand, in naked formality, would be applied by ourselves unconsciously, in the case of an actual penitent, whom we saw before us.

On these principles we are told that we may understand the purpose and meaning of these much vilified books. They were meant, not for lay Christians *before* the act, but for confessors *after* it; to teach the priest how to measure and deal with what could no longer be helped;—the utmost that he had a right to exact, and the least that he might accept;—not to teach the penitent the means of eluding duty, and still escaping sin. They represent not what men are to be taught to do, but only how far they may be allowed *not* to do as they are taught. ‘They are not *receipts* given to penitents, to sweeten for them the remedy of confession, but rules of conduct and judgment for priests.’ ‘This simple reflection,’ adds M. Maynard, ‘causes to fall to the ground all the accusations of Pascal.’ And they are to be considered as coming first to the knowledge of the penitent, and the mass of people, when applied to their case by the confessor. They were not intended for the public; they were written in Latin, and the world has no business to know these rules, nor Pascal to divulge them. Thus M. Maynard, after asking whether there is no danger in so many *subtle*

the University of Paris, a Carmelite and a Minor, certifying that they had found nothing in it dissonant from the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman faith, and judged it worthy of publication, dated 1644; the licence of the ordinary in consequence of this approbation, and the consent and permission of the civil power.

He goes through, in the way of short questions and answers, the subject of Moral Theology, under seven heads, to which he applies in allegory the seven seals of the book of the Apocalypse. These are—*Laws, Sins, Justice, Censures, Virtues, State of Life, Sacraments*: each division, or *examen*, after discussing general principles, ends with a chapter of practical solutions, entitled ‘*Praxis ex Societatis Jesu Schola*,’ on the previous subjects.

questions on morality, in such speculatively bold decisions, which must necessarily '*briser bientôt les liens de l'abstraction, pour entrer dans le domaine des faits,*' thus answers:—

'Peut-être. Mais songeons bien que les Casuistes n'écrivaient que pour les confesseurs, et non pour le monde. encore moins pour les plaisants; que leur maximes, dont il peut être facile d'abuser, ne s'adressaient pas à la foule ignorante ou corrompue, mais à des hommes graves, instruits, vertueux, &c. . . . Leurs livres étaient écrits en Latin, qui n'est pas la langue de la multitude; c'étaient des énormes en folio, inabordable à la foule légère, des œuvres à formes techniques et barbares, peu attrayantes pour la frivolité. Aussi étaient-ils renfermés dans les écoles et les bibliothèques, sans que jamais une main profane eût songé à les ouvrir pour en répandre le secret et le prétendu venin sur le monde. . . . Tout cela devait rester un mystère entre le confesseur et la conscience coupable. Le poison, si tant est que les Casuistes en renfermassent, devait être exclusivement confié aux mains habiles et prudentes des médecins des âmes, qui l'auraient toujours transformés en remède salutaire. Aussi Escobar, fut-il tout étonné du rétentissement que son œuvre avait en France. Cet humble religieux ne pouvait comprendre sa triste célébrité: cet homme, à l'âme et aux intentions si pures, concevait encore moins qu'on détournât de leur sens et de leur but les conseils qu'il avait adressés exclusivement aux confesseurs, pour les aider à diriger leurs frères dans la voie du bien.'—Vol. i. pp. 206, 207.

No doubt. The books might be written in Latin and in folio; the confessor as careful as he could be to keep Escobar out of 'profane hands.' But, besides that among people like the French, what was to be read in Latin could not long be kept secret from those whom it concerned—not to say that an indiscreet Père Bauny might publish French '*Sums of Theology*,'—it does not seem to have occurred to M. Maynard, that supposing a sufficient degree of intelligence and memory in the penitent, he might come to comprehend these rules by their application to his own case; and supposing him to be weak and self-deceiving, he might abuse this knowledge as much as if he had learnt it straight from Escobar or Pascal. And where every Christian was supposed to come to the confessional, and the mass of them to require the benefit of these indulgent decisions, it is not easy to suppose, with M. Maynard, that it is to Pascal and the Jansenists that the world in general is indebted for its knowledge that such decisions exist, or to imagine that it must have waited till it learned them from such informants, before it could have taken practical advantage of them. And with respect to M. Maynard's distinction, we must add, that a simple inspection of these books is sufficient to show that they were meant to tell the priest, not only how to judge of the past, but to advise about the future.

Thus, however, the inculcated system is defended—on the ground of its being a highly practical one. Its startling results are but the anomalies which attend all working systems.

Arguments may prove them wrong, but they turn out right in practice. But besides this, M. Maynard has two more defences in reserve. Side by side, or alternately, with the plea that it is *highly practical*, is the plea that it is *only speculative*. Having proved that it is intended only for the confessional, and that the confessional cannot do without it, M. Maynard offers us another point of view. It is, he says, the inevitable development of logical consequences; the mere course of abstract thought—subtle intellect, analysing metaphysically, or playing with possibilities, in the greater men; simple '*logomachies*' in the lesser. '*Systems of morality*,' says M. Maynard, '*about which we may dispute for ever, have no serious influence on life*;' and this casuistry was a '*veritable science, more metaphysical than moral, which, on pain of appearing incomplete, was bound to embrace all questions that were possible and even chimerical*.'¹ Its startling conclusions were simply the result of '*studies purely speculative*.'² Even those about duelling, tyrannicide, and killing false witnesses, which were condemned for their practical danger by the Pope, '*were certainly*,' we are informed, '*admissible in principle and in theory*.'³

Finally, when, in some particular case, the general suggestions of its being practically useful, or merely speculative, or both, have been gone through, and we have been further reminded of that '*candid and charitable simplicity*, which would not impose on the weak shoulders of men anything more than the least heavy burden possible, and sometimes placed itself outside the Gospel 'in seeking to reconcile our duties and our miserable doings,' he treats the whole matter as a trifle not worth talking about—as something, on the face of it, absurd and impossible, except as a little flourish of sportive subtlety; and turns round on us and laughs in our face, for being such simpletons as to suppose, that the inculcated Casuist ever meant his words to be taken in earnest.

We are rather at a loss to describe the general effect upon our mind of M. Maynard's way of arguing. It is, more than anything we can bring to mind, like the equestrian performer, who is carried round the ring, jumping from one horse's back to the other. The Abbé employs two main principles, the necessities of a practical, and the liberty of a speculative system; and his argument has the appearance of invoking, as soon as he is embarrassed in the use of one, the assistance of its apparently discordant opposite. Thus it proceeds, through a series of alternations, to its triumphant close. And at length, when it

¹ Vol. i.² Vol. i. p. 200.³ Vol. i. pp. 200, 205, 309.

ends, we are left to reflect whether what has so much engaged our attention is anything more than elaborate nonsense.

M. Maynard's mode of defence will be best understood by an instance or two.

It may be remembered, for instance, that Pascal quotes a number of remarkable dicta about duelling, and homicide in general. M. Maynard deals with them at considerable length. He notices that they arose in a state of society when there was little public law.¹ He reminds us that these decisions are of a local kind:—

'La doctrine, qu'on peut tuer pour l'honneur n'est guère admise que par les théologiens étrangers, en Espagne surtout, où l'honneur n'est pas une passion seulement, mais une sorte de religion. Les Jésuites inculpés sous ce rapport ne se sont pas écartés de l'enseignement reçu dans leur pays. Ce peut être un tort, mais on ne saurait leur en faire, sans injustice, un crime propre et personnel. Ces théologiens se fondaient sur ce que l'infamie est pour un homme de cœur pire que la mort: il doit donc être permis de défendre l'honneur comme la vie elle-même.'

Critical persons might think it equally strange, that so large a proportion of Roman doctors as the theologians of Spain and Italy, should be called anywhere, even in France, '*étrangers*;' and that local feelings about honour and bloodshed should be a reason for their playing fast and loose with the Sixth Commandment. However, M. Maynard, after discussing the limits of what is allowable on the subject, thus sums up what he considers to be their real drift and purport:—

'Nous achevons cette discussion, sans craindre d'avoir mis le poignard aux mains des assassins, quoique nous ayons exposé, sans la frapper en général d'anathème, la doctrine des Jésuites. Nous ne croyons pas que jamais un glaive se soit aiguisé à ces théories purement spéculatives, ou qu'on ne proposât pas pour règles de conduite, mais d'appréciation d'un fait accompli. En les offrant aux confesseurs, les théologiens ne leur disaient pas: "Voilà ce que vous pouvez permettre, encore moins conseiller;" mais, "Voilà où il y a crime, voilà un fait moins coupable, voilà une défense entièrement légitime. Néanmoins, sans vous arroger la mission de vouer à l'enfer un meurtrier qui n'a fait qu'user de son droit rigoureux, ayez bien garde de le féliciter de sa conduite, comme s'il avait accompli un acte de vertu, et engagez-le à préférer désormais à tout la divine douceur de l'évangile.

'Telle était la seule doctrine qu'on prêchât au peuple. Les décisions de l'école, choquantes au premier aspect, moins choquantes cependant dans les principes que dans les applications que les théologiens se croyaient obligés de donner toutes, ne devaient pas être communiquées au public. Si elles présentent quelque danger, l'imprudence n'est pas dans les théologiens, mais dans ceux qui les ont divulguées.'—Vol. i. p. 313.

This is the general view of the matter. The theologians wished to secure a liberal and long-suffering considerateness in

¹ 'Les maximes des Casuistes sur l'homicide et le duel se sentaient nécessairement du régime féodal et barbare, dans lequel elles étaient toutes naturelles.'

the confessors whom they instructed. They were not to be hasty and sour, even with homicides. On the other hand, they were to 'take care not to *felicitate them on their conduct.*' The theologians had foreseen even this contingency, and provided against it.

But when we come to the decisions *one by one*, they are defended, not for their practical good, but for their impossibility. These nice rules, so minutely analyzed, these delicate balancings, so wisely adjusted by prudence and charity, finally turn, it appears, into nonsense when taken literally. The decision complained of is merely one of the *speculative* 'applications, of which the theologians thought themselves bound to give all.' The question is a minutely practical one; but the answer, though equally minute, is only speculative. The greatest subtlety and care are shown, for instance, in marking out when a duel may be fought; circumstances carefully distinguished, as whether 'a gentleman is known "*pour n'être pas dévôt*,"' so that he will be thought to act from fear of man and not of God, and so that men will call him, *gallina et non vir*; he is directed not to intend to fight a duel, but only to *walk about in a field*:—and the end of it all is, that we are informed, 'that this, though probable in speculation, is extremely difficult in practice,' and that the careful Casuist himself is related to have prescribed the contrary in his book '*De Charitate.*'¹

Again, Molina names *about* the sum—four or five ducats—for *less than* which we *may not* kill a thief who is stealing, but will not 'dare to condemn' a man who kills for a crown or less; Escobar draws from Molina's estimate, that 'we may regularly (*regulariter*) kill the thief for the value of a gold crown;' and Pascal represents Molina as estimating at *six or seven ducats* the value for which we *may* kill the thief. '*Voilà*,' says M. Maynard,² '*ce qui s'appelle une bonne calomnie.*' However, he gives up Escobar. Why is Escobar wrong?—for wrong he is,

¹ 'None of our duels,' he says, 'would find in these *purely metaphysical decisions*, any principle of justification.' (Vol. i. p. 322. Lett. 7me.) If Layman says, '*Je n'ose pas condamner*,'—(not '*je ne vois pas qu'on puisse condamner*,'—here is one of Pascal's 'falsifications,') 'a man who accepts a duel,' it is only in view of a '*considerable loss*,—which explains the *illusion of the Casuists*:' and besides, this is only in *rare cases, almost chimerical ones.*' (Vol. i. p. 325.) If Jesuits are quoted, saying that 'we may kill false-witnesses,' we are told that it was not they only, for 'that this doctrine was then common in the schools;' but the Jesuits regard it as lawful only '*en ce qui touche la conscience*, c'est à dire, suivant le droit naturel, rigoureux, en dehors des prohibitions positives, et des inconvénients qui en sont inséparable dans la pratique.' (Vol. i. p. 327.) 'The Casuists, evidently, reason almost always for men in a state of nature, obliged to do justice for themselves; this is what they call *speculation*; but in practice, that is, in the state of society, they forbid it absolutely.' (Vol. i. p. 334.)

² Vol. i. pp. 337, 338.

his proposition having found its way into the condemned list of Innocent XI. All that M. Maynard sees in it is excess of precision, whether over-speculative or over-practical, he does not say. It is morally impossible to fix the sum; and, he adds, 'l'Eglise n'ayant rien décidé sur ce point,' (how much the thief might be killed for,) 'et n'ayant condamné qu'une proposition,' (31^e du Décret d'Innocent XI.) *qui autorisait à tuer pour un écu d'or*, somme régulièrement parlant insuffisante, *on doit être très-réservé à cet égard.*¹

To take another subject, Pascal accuses the Casuists of explaining away the duty of attention in the acts of worship. The Church tells men to go to mass; it is hard to imagine for what purpose but to pray, and to pray rightly; and equally hard to imagine, how any other way of going could be prescribed, or thought of. But it was not so simple a matter, and gave rise to great questions, about how, and when, and with what intention the precept was to be satisfied. There were *pros* and *cons* on the subject; there was a severe school which exacted attention; another which maintained that the Church cannot command internal acts. As an extreme specimen of what *could be* put out to the world on this point, we will quote the following passage from Caramuel, whose name will be remembered by readers of Pascal—not a Jesuit, though a warm admirer of the order, and an enthusiastic votary of the *generous and clement* way of philosophising about moral questions. The Casuist Diana was said by envious rivals, '*esse agnum Dei, qui tollit peccata mundi.*' Caramuel is explaining the phrase in Diana's honour: ²—

'Let Navarrus,' he says, 'and the old Casuists have their own glory; let them be lions and get praise for their severity; be you the lamb, praised for benignity. Let those who please follow the lions—those who distrust with me their own frailty will more wisely follow you. *Hi sunt,*' he proceeds, '*qui cum mulieribus non sunt coinquinati virgines enim sunt, et sequuntur agnum quocunque ierit.*'

Of this he gives the following allegorical exposition:—

'These are the disciples and admirers of Diana. The opinions of Doctors at this day "*differunt genere.*" Some are *masculine*, others *feminine*, not to

¹ Vol. i. p. 310.

² It occurs in a letter to the Sicilian Casuist Diana, also not a Jesuit, in which Caramuel sets forth his friend Diana's European reputation and well-grounded claims to promotion at the hands of the Holy See. Diana was the Casuist whose 'industry had made many opinions probable which were not so before.' '*Tota æmulorum oblocutio pervenit ad columnas Herculis cum dicunt, Dianam esse Agnum Dei qui tollit peccata mundi. Idem ego frequenter inculco ut te commendem, . . . ejus industriâ multas opiniones evasisse probabiles quæ antea non erant. Si jam sint probabiles quæ antea non erant, jam non peccant qui eas sequuntur, licet antea peccaverint: ergo si ejusmodi peccata ab orbe literario Diana sustulit, merito dicetur esse Agnum,*' &c.

But now, let us see how, not Caramuel, but M. Maynard, speaks of the kindred decision of certain theologians, that 'it was sufficient to be present at mass in body, though absent in mind, *pourvu qu'on demeure dans une contenance respectueuse extérieurement.*' On this, M. Maynard observes as follows; the diffidence of himself and his client are remarkable, in the presence of the 'great theologians,' whom they venture to differ from, or to follow with reluctance:—

'This decision, like the following ones, appears at least singular, in its abstract form. But it depends on a question long debated among theologians: whether the Church can command an internal act, either directly, or at least indirectly, so far as it is necessary for giving to the external act a real virtue. After a great number of authors whom he cites, Coninch maintains the negative, *out of respect*, he says, *for S. Thomas,* (because there can be no command, but so far as there is power to *punish*, and, therefore, power to *judge*: and the Church, except in confession, can only judge and punish external acts.) 'According to this opinion, which we do not hold, but which has been defended by great theologians, Coninch advances, 1, That the ecclesiastical precept is satisfied by hearing mass without bringing to it any interior affection, provided that one be present with external respect, so as to exercise truly an external act of religion, and be in external communion of prayer with the priest. But, 2, he adds, what Pascal has taken good care not to say,—that a man so violates the precept of natural right, bidding us to attend mass with devotion, and sins against the respect due to God and the holy mysteries. Thus understood, the sentiment may be false, and we believe it such; but it does not in any way *facilitate the use of holy things*, and does not lead either to contempt of the sacrifice, or impiety, or even to negligence in the accomplishment of religious duties.'—Vol. i. pp. 435, 436.

Unless the restrictions reduce the rule simply to no sense at all, it certainly seems considerably 'to facilitate the use of holy things.' A precept of the Church—to violate which is mortal sin—about a religious act, which to be worth doing at all must be an inward act, yet restrained exclusively to the external act;—satisfied as a precept, yet involving sin in the mode of satisfying;—the doctrine maintained stoutly by great and wise doctors, and yet, though intelligible only as a practical matter, condemned by its maintainers, except in speculation;—all this presents a curious union of conditions. The practical Escobar, however, goes a step further. He lays down, that mass may be heard '*comme il faut,*' by a person not only absent in mind, but intent on bad thoughts, and present for the purpose of indulging them: '*qu'une méchant intention, comme de regarder les femmes avec un désir impur, jointe à celle d'ouïr la messe comme il faut, n'empêche pas qu'on n'y satisfasse.*' Very shocking, indeed, says M. Maynard; but what can you do? you may be out of temper with Escobar, but Escobar will answer you that he is simply arguing from a doctrine maintained by great

authorities, about the '*comme il faut*' of hearing mass: no one can help 'logical consequences:—

'Cette vilaine proposition est inexcusable, bien qu'elle suive assez logiquement du sentiment que l'Eglise ne commande pas les actes intérieurs.'—Vol. i. p. 437.

Besides, he *supposes*, all the time, that the outward attention to the service is kept up simultaneously: '*il suppose toujours, que l'attention extérieure subsiste.*' Then M. Maynard bids us observe that '*il ne justifie pas ces mauvais regards dans la circonstance, encore moins en eux-mêmes, et il y verrait volontiers un infâme sacrilège.*' But having done what was candid in admitting, in Escobar's name as well as his own, that this would be '*un infâme sacrilège,*' and for himself, that Escobar's conclusion was a '*vilaine proposition,*' he proceeds to express his inability to see what can be the harm of it, or what people can mean by quibbling about such a trifle: '*Puis pour la pratique, il nous est impossible de comprendre en quoi tout cela peut nuire à la piété Catholique: ce sont de subtilités d'esprit misérables, scabreuses même, si l'on veut,*' (candid man!) '*et rien de plus.*' Why then put these miserable subtleties in practical books? Oh! he says, they have their use; practical questions for confessors may arise, which they may be wanted to answer. 'On pourrait, cependant, ajouter, que toutes ces questions n'étaient pas *absolument oiseuses*, et qu'elles *tendaient à décider* si, quelque pût être le péché commis par le pénitent pendant la messe, *il était obligé d'entendre une autre.*' So that rather than trust the confessor's common sense, to settle whether, to comply with the command of the Church, a man who had abominably profaned one mass was bound to hear another, Escobar might 'tend to decide it' by putting in his book that the Church's precept could be satisfied by an '*infâme sacrilège,*' without erring, apparently, in more than judgment. Is there much difference between Caramuel and M. Maynard?

We will take one more case;—that of what M. Maynard terms the 'theory of equivocations and mental restrictions:'¹ a theory, which, he says, 'had been known in the schools for two centuries;' and so far from the Jesuits having been its inventors, 'at the date of the *Provinciales*, it would not have been easy to find more than three or four theologians of an opposite sentiment.' 'A doctrine so universally adopted must have solid foundations;' and, as it has continued to be taught in the Church by strict theologians, even after the condemnation of certain propositions by the Pope, we must conclude that only its abuses were condemned.

¹ *Vide* Lettre IX.

How, he says, can you do without *some* theory to reconcile veracity with other often conflicting duties? and what harm can there be in *this* one, when its maintainers tell you never to apply or use equivocation when it is not right, or in a wrong way? The following *exposé* of its principles is stated to be but an analysis of the learned Jesuit Sanchez:—

‘It is necessary,’ he begins, ‘first, to shelter from all accusation of falsehood divers holy personages of the Bible, who appear in word and deed to have departed from the way of simple and straightforward truth, *e.g.* Abraham and Isaac, Jacob calling himself the eldest son to his father, the angel of Tobias taking the name of some high person in Israel. Several saints of the New Testament appear to have had recourse to equivocation; and certain expressions of our Lord are hard to explain in their obvious and natural sense.’

Then after noticing that a man is often placed between contradictory obligations, he states as follows the distinctions by which the Casuists saved equivocation from the guilt of lying, and guarded its right use:—

‘The objections to the “*system of equivocations*” are obvious; but any other system is just as open to difficulty, especially as applied to the facts of the Bible. Nevertheless, the holders of the system of equivocation could not rest under the charge of excusing lies and deceit. So they establish two sorts of restrictions, one allowed, the other forbidden; the “*purely mental*,” where it is absolutely impossible to discover the truth, and the “*sensible*,” of which the sense *might be discovered* by certain signs or circumstances, though more often it must remain hidden. Again, they distinguished between the equivocation *sensible*, and the equivocation *at pleasure* (*forgée à plaisir*), of which the meaning is purely arbitrary.

‘In this manner, say they, not only is a person without the intention of deceiving, but he does not *necessarily* deceive at all, because it is *possible* to discover the truth; and there is no injustice, for it is assumed that one party has no right to know, nor the other to reveal the truth. So there is no wish to “*faire accroire une chose fautive*,” as Pascal says; such an intention would be condemned by all theologians. Moreover, there is no mischief done to human society, for equivocations are not resorted to under every circumstance, but in exceptional cases, where there are grave inconveniences in discovering the truth, and a real necessity and duty to keep it silent.’—Vol. i. pp. 421, 422.

So far for *general* statement. If a theory were true because it is wanted, it is clear that it is often inconvenient, hard, undesirable—sometimes wrong, to state truth. But, as M. Maynard truly remarks, ‘the real difficulty is in its application.’ Does it help us out of our perplexities? The difficulties of astronomy remained after the invention of cycles and epicycles. M. Maynard admits, indeed, that in their application of the ‘solid’ and safe principles, the theologians were occasionally mistaken; but, ‘why should that be made a crime in them?’

Pascal, for instance, quotes from Sanchez, ‘*that we may swear that we have not done something which we have done, by under-*

'standing mentally, that we did not do it on such a day, or before we were born, or with some such circumstances.' Here is certainly a very definite way of using equivocation, and escaping, we are told, lying or perjury. M. Maynard appears to think that it only wants the rules, conditions, and restrictions, omitted by Pascal, to make it a practical solution of possible perplexities. But it seems, that all the conditions necessary are contained in the passage which we have quoted above—an analysis of this same Sanchez. M. Maynard is easily satisfied. Pascal goes on to another particular case, yet stronger. Filliucci is more definite even than Sanchez. M. Maynard *appears*—we cannot say for certain more—to accept this also, as a satisfactory way of escaping from the difficulties of veracity. At any rate he will not give up Filliucci. Pascal observes, that he says that Sanchez's method of equivocation is neither lie nor perjury:—

'Parceque c'est "l'intention qui règle la qualité de l'action." Et il y donne encore un autre moyen plus sûr d'éviter le mensonge. C'est qu'après avoir dit tout haut, *Je jure que je n'ai point fait cela*, on ajoute tout bas, *aujourd'hui*; ou qu'après avoir dit tout haut, *Je jure*, on dise tout bas, *que je dis*; et que l'on continue ensuite tout haut, *que je n'ai point fait cela*. Vous voyez bien que c'est dire la vérité. Je l'avoue, lui dis-je; mais nous trouverions, peut-être, que c'est dire la vérité tout bas, et un mensonge tout haut: outre, que je craindrais que bien de gens n'eussent pas assez de présence d'esprit pour se servir de ces méthodes. Nos pères, dit-il, ont enseigné au même lieu, en faveur de ceux qui ne sauraient pas user de ces restrictions, qu'il leur suffit, pour ne point mentir, de dire simplement, qu'ils n'ont point fait ce qu'ils ont fait, pourvu qu'ils aient en général l'intention de donner à leur discours le sens qu'un habile homme y donnerait.'

We will here quote the curiously stated decisions of the Penitentiary on '*Amphibologia*,' and then our readers may judge for themselves of M. Maynard's comments on him and on Pascal:

'Filliucci, after stating, on the question, "whether, if the *amphibologia* be solely mental, it is lawful to swear?"—that it is a probable opinion that it is not lawful, but a more probable one that it is; "for that, out of the word spoken and the mental restriction is made one compound speech in which is no falsehood, and that it is free for a man to compound his speech of terms spoken and mental;" and after proving this by S. Gregory, who says that "the Prophet sometimes joined the word which one sounded by the mouth, to the word of the mind, which is reason," confirms his position thus: "It is confirmed by the example of Christ's words, '*of that day no man knows*,' and '*I go not up to this feast*,' in which one thing is said in the outward words, and another understood in the internal ones." He then says that the mental restriction ought not to be arbitrary, but proportionate to the words and matter, so that, *with explanation*, the words might be understood in the intended sense; and he gives the following rules, "*ad utendum amphibologia*."

'Fourthly, I inquire, with what caution must *amphibologia* be used? answer, and say, first, besides what has just been observed, two modes may be assigned for persons endued with judgment; the first is, to

have the intention of expressing the outward words materially, and for greater security; when the person begins, for instance, by saying, *I swear that*—to interpose in a low voice the mental restriction, *to-day*—and then to add in a loud voice, “*I did not eat this or that*,” or, “*I swear that*”—then interpose, “*I say that*”—then finish in a loud voice, “*I did not do this or that*,” for so the whole speech is most true. The second way is, to have the intention of not completing the speech merely by external words, but, at the same time, with a mental restriction; for a man is at liberty to express his mind wholly or partially. But for the untaught, who cannot understand ambiguous expression in the particular, (*pro rudibus qui nesciunt in particulari concipere amphibologiam*,) it is sufficient if they have the intention of affirming or denying in the sense which in reality contains truth; for which it is necessary that they should know, at least in the universal, that they can deny in some true sense, otherwise they could not speak in a true sense.’

He then says that this mode of expression by ambiguous words, especially where the restriction is mental, is not to be used without a ‘*just cause*,’ otherwise a fault is committed, and if with an oath, a grave fault; and proceeds to inquire *what* sort of fault. Is it a lie? and, if sworn to, perjury? He answers, that it is *probable* that it is, and gives reasons why; but *more probable* that it is not:—

‘I say, in the second place, that it seems more probable that in strictness it is not a lie, or perjury. The principal reason is, that he who so speaks and swears has not the intention of saying what is false, or swearing to it, as is presupposed; and what is expressed, in strictness has some true sense, which the person intends; therefore he does not lie (from Navarr. cap. *Humanæ Aures*, 22, 9, 5). For the intention characterises (*discernit*) the action. It is confirmed from S. Thomas, 2. 2. 9, 55, Art. 3, where cunning (*astutia*) is said to be the vice contrary to prudence; but he who uses “*amphibologia*” is, at the utmost, astute; therefore, &c. . . But it is not repugnant to human truth and good faith, because it is not opposed to it by a defect of truth, but by an excessive occultation of truth. Hence it is that to confirm this by an oath is not strictly perjury, but a certain want of religiousness (*irreligiositas quædam*), and if there be scandal, from the outward semblance of perjury, it will be brought to the evil of that; which [evil] has most place in ambiguous expression with mental restriction, as Suarez rightly teaches.’—*Fill. Moral. Quæst.* Tr. xxv. cap. xi. nn. 325—331.

Such is Filliucci’s statement, little more than copied, as is the wont of these writers, even to the illustrations, from a predecessor—in this case, one of the greatest of the Casuists, Suarez. M. Maynard thus excepts to Pascal’s use of it:—

‘We have nearly the same thing to say of Filliucci as of Sanchez. This principle, that “*the intention regulates the quality of the action*,” has been quoted by Pascal in a very dishonest way. It means merely that we must never, even in case of mental restriction, have the intention to deceive, but only to hide a truth which our neighbour has no right to know. Such is also the sense of the general rule, “*to have the intention to give to our words the sense which a clever man (un habile homme) would give them*.” This rule is for the ignorant who may use ambiguous terms (*cette règle est pour les ignorants qui useraient d’amphibologie*). As it is never allowed to speak

contrary to our thought, then, if they do not understand the expedient which they use, (*s'ils ne comprennent pas le tour dont ils se servent*), they ought to have the intention in general of giving to it the sense which a clever man would give it.—Vol. i. p. 425.

There is something delightful in the simplicity with which M. Maynard disposes of the matter, by merely tacitly translating the restriction which Filliucci thinks sufficient. We must add, as we have so often had the distinction between speculation and practice, that Suarez, the original authority, assures us that this doctrine, so stated, is '*practice securissima*.'¹

These are the sort of subjects on which, according to M. Maynard, men cannot be expected to be of one mind—the subjects to which the doctrine of Probabilism applies. 'If there are in morals some points which are certain, there are others which are not, which come into the domain of the probable, and of opinion. Do what we will, take up what system we please, there will always be controverted principles, embarrassing cases, through which we cannot guide ourselves by a certainty and evidence which do not exist, but only by the glimmering twilight of reasons or authorities more or less plausible.'² The men whom Pascal accuses of such diversity of sentiment, are, he says, agreed, 'first on all the principles which are certain or defined by Scripture, tradition, and the Church; then on all the doctrines commonly received in the Catholic schools. As for *controverted opinions*, whatever system of morals we embrace, we shall never be agreed.'³

But he treats with scorn the idea that these open questions, and, as he allows very often, singular solutions of them, could have the smallest effect on feeling, opinion, or practice. He coolly parallels them to the books of medical and legal science,—an analogy which might perhaps do for the questions, if they had not the answers to them. We must oppose to M. Maynard's opinion, one which on this point is at least as 'probable.' On a matter of fact, at least, the authority of the famous Caramuel may be of weight. An injudicious director may yet be a fair witness, especially against himself; and so great was his confidence in his favourite science, that he could afford the admission that M. Maynard shrinks from. Caramuel attests the fact, that 'inconvenience' did result from many of the most probable opinions of the schools; only he thinks it a very paltry argument to infer, that therefore they are not probable:—

'You will say that from this doctrine,' [he is speaking, we may observe, of the famous *conclusio conclusionum* of Pascal's seventh Letter,] 'many inconveniences arise, and therefore it is to be rejected. And I answer, that

¹ Suarez de Rel. tom. ii. tr. 4. lib. iii. c. 10. n. 4.

² Vol. i. p. 199.

³ Vol. i. p. 241.

to say, "From such and such an assertion great dangers and mischiefs arise, therefore it is false," is not a good consequence.' [He then instances, e. g. an assertion which might throw a whole kingdom into a revolution, yet would not be the less true, and proceeds—it will be observed that we are quoting him only as a witness to fact.] 'Hence it is that I judge that the highest inconveniences (*summa inconvenientia*) follow from many opinions, which are at this day in vogue in the schools, yet that these opinions are not therefore improbable. For many inconveniences arise from mental restrictions; many from secret compensations; many from the permission to kill an unjust judge or witness, which some grant; many also from the opinion which teaches, that of secret things the Church judges not; many from others; notwithstanding which inconveniences, these opinions, in the terms in which they are at this day delivered in the schools, are at the very least most probable, and may not be condemned by any (*sunt ad minimum probabilissimæ, et a nemine damnari possunt*).—*Theolog. Fundam.* No. 1150. Ed. Franc. 1652.

To this we are quite aware that there is a summary and specious answer. It is, that the Popes, in spite of Caramuel, have condemned these discreditable opinions, and banished them for ever from the teaching of the Church. Whatever might be said inconsiderately in 1650, yet when Alexander VII. and Innocent XI. spoke, a few years later, Jesuits and all submitted with absolute reverence to the decision of Rome, and no theologian can be cited who has since then said these things.

To this a rejoinder might be supposed, that it was but a make-believe condemnation, or one brought about accidentally by the policy or revenge of the moment; that when Rome meant to condemn in earnest, as in the case of the Jansenists, there was no mistake in her way of doing it; that here, though she happened to fix on most of the propositions quoted by Pascal, she simply condemned them in their bare literal sense, and said nothing as to why and how she condemned them; that Casuists might still treat the censures as sullen lawyers do an Act of Parliament,—maintain that their method was unrebuked, and that the propositions were condemned, not as morally shocking, but merely verbally inexact, and might still hold others next door to them with impunity. It might be urged, that apparently they had only become wrong, since and because the Popes condemned them, and their previous tolerance indicates that it was little more than a formal stigma.

On the other hand, it might be said, that it is unfair thus to explain away the obvious purport of the Popes' act; that we ought to take it for what it looks like—the condemnation of a dangerous mode of thought or expression in certain palpable samples of it, as Jansenism was condemned in the Five Propositions, or in the 101 of the Bull *Unigenitus*; that the propositions are nearly the same as those which Bossuet got condemned by the Assembly of 1700, and we know that he condemned in them the spirit and system which had produced them.

Now how does M. Maynard deal with this? For it is obvious that for him, in proportion as it removes one difficulty, it brings in another. Apparently, at least, if it clears the Popes, it compromises the Casuists; and in proportion as we give weight and significance to the condemnation, it seems to fix on them the load of a mischievous and at length intolerable teaching,—intolerable even to that very authority of which they were the champions. The fact, of course, he more than admits. ‘Long before 1679,’ he says, ‘the Jesuits had been able to cite more than thirty of their theologians, anterior even to the *Provinciales*, on the necessity of the love of God in penitence. With much stronger reason, then, did they abstain, after the pontifical sentence, to teach any of the propositions condemned by Innocent XI.’¹ Whether the mistake was practical, ‘these men, who were led astray by benevolent and pure intentions, to impose on weak men the least burden possible,—renounced their error as soon as it was pointed out to them *by their superiors*, and especially *by the Holy See*; and thus the evil was dried up at its source;’² or whether it was but mere speculation, ‘they renounced even their abstractions, as soon as any point of doctrine had been prescribed by the Holy See. Thus it would be impossible to cite a single theologian who has permitted the murder of the unjust judge, or of the false witnesses, since the censure of the 18th proposition of the decree of Alexander VII.; and the most celebrated authors,’ it is added, with some boldness of assertion, ‘had not waited till then to condemn it in their works.’³ We do not for a moment doubt the submission; yet M. Maynard seems to make more of a merit of it than is quite intelligible. The sacrifice of submitting to be debarred from such propositions as that ‘the love of God is not necessary for penitence,’ or that ‘we may seek occasions of sin for our own good or that of our neighbour,’ does not seem so very hard, any more than the glory very singular of not having maintained them.

But we should, it appears, be grossly mistaken, if we saw in these censures any such condemnation, or even discountenancing, of principles, or methods of arguing or stating, as the Bull *Unigenitus* is of Jansenism as a whole. The decrees of Alexander and Innocent are, we are told to observe, censures, not of doctrines, but of *propositions*. The propositions are given up, of course; and there is an end of the matter. But the authors are not named, and are therefore untouched. What the Church has decided upon is nothing but certain extreme and lax applications of a recognised way of treating moral questions. The

¹ Vol. i. p. 183.² Vol. i. p. 210.³ Vol. i. p. 304.

propositions are to be taken one by one, as separate, isolated, for the most part trifling, or accidental mistakes, each to be set down to the account of him who made it: and who does not make mistakes? And as we are not to gather from the censure that the Church meant to notice them as an aggregate and significant phenomenon, such as Pascal sees in them; so, on each subject touched by the propositions, beyond the strict letter of the proposition censured the condemnation does not reach.

It was, for instance, as M. Maynard tells us, a *common doctrine* at the time *in the schools*—by no means confined to the Jesuits, and, indeed, not accepted by several of them—that it is lawful to kill beforehand false witnesses against us. ‘Speculatively, indeed,’ says M. Maynard,² ‘it will be legitimate, for it flows logically from natural right, general principles, and analogy with permitted cases;’ and it is difficult to see in what this ‘horrible consequence’ ‘differs from the case of unjust aggression and lawful self-defence.’ And the theologians ‘added almost always,’ that speculatively only was it lawful. Turned into practice, ‘it would involve an almost inevitable sin.’ Therefore, and so far only, it was condemned. The practical dangers (which for once M. Maynard admits) ‘caused to be absolutely condemned by the Popes a certain number of propositions on this subject, *certainly admissible in principle and in theory. But the theologians who confined themselves within the limits of pure abstraction and metaphysical precision are not touched by these censures.*’ The general doctrine on homicide, which Pascal imputes to the Jesuits, is not merely unjustly made peculiar to them, but ‘has never been condemned by the Church.’³ So with the ‘*système des équivoques*,’ which we have already alluded to:—

‘The adversaries of this system,’ says M. Maynard, ‘object to the propositions condemned by Innocent XI. and the Clergy of France in 1700. It would be singular enough,’ he proceeds, ‘that if the system of equivocations was absolutely condemned, it should continue to be taught by a great number of theologians with the full cognizance of the Church, and by theologians, too, very little suspected of relaxed moral opinions. . . . We must suppose, therefore, that it is only the abuses and excesses of the system which are touched by the censure. That this answer is founded in reason may be seen by the examination of the condemned propositions. The 26th of Innocent XI. permits, without distinction, every restriction, even purely mental, under every circumstance, with or without reason; the 27th measures the use of it only by the private advantage of him who uses it, without regard to the public interest, often opposed to private, or to the exceptions laid down by theologians; the 28th authorizes reservations in cases where the public good, law, and morality require a plain and straightforward oath, by a culpable abuse of the principle, that a man is

¹ Vol. i. p. 327.² Vol. i. pp. 303, 304.³ Vol. i. p. 310.

condition than others. '*Avec ces limitations, la décision de Bauny n'est pas dangereuse, surtout si le confesseur est laissé juge, et bien rarement trouvera-t-il son application.*'¹ And thus the honour and the intention of both Pope and Casuist, though seemingly of directly opposite views, are judiciously reconciled. But it brings forcibly before us how difficult a thing it must be to 'condemn' a proposition.

So much for the effect of the condemnation. It is a *fait accompli*, to be treated with all respect. But M. Maynard suggests that its importance is still further diminished, if we consider its history:—

'Madame de Sevigné is too amusing,' he observes, 'when she affects so much pity for her "*paucres frères*," whom she makes into victims when they were really persecutors. . . . "When they did not consult the Pope," she says, "they were schismatics; when they complain to him about these *opinions probables*, they are rebels." *Eh! oui, sans doute, Madame*; they first did not consult the Pope, for fear of hearing the condemnation of their heretical doctrines; they afterwards have recourse to him to denounce faithful priests, and trouble further the Church and the State. In the first case, were they not *schismatics*; in the second, *rebels*? *Louis XIV. was therefore wise in placing his agents on the great roads, to prevent any such communications between the Pope and the Jansenists.* But he did not succeed in barring that passage to them, and the denunciation reached Innocent XI. The Pope then pronounced on the question of fact, not on that of right, and condemned, in 1679, the sixty-five propositions, as he was bound to condemn them, wherever found, to show that the Church does not approve laxities in morality. But he did not attribute them to the Jesuits, or condemn them as corrupters of morality.'—Vol. i. pp. 182, 183.

But, though it might have been owing to the unfortunate failure of the efforts of Louis XIV. to stop them, that the Jansenists succeeded in forcing the Pope to consider an inopportune question, his decision, when forced, could be but one way, and was right. A modest foot-note, however, ventures further to insinuate the intrusion of a cause which takes off still more from the real, though not the formal effect of the act. The Jesuits knew the Pope's duty better than himself sometimes; but a price must be paid for helping a man in spite of himself:—

'We must observe, however, that Innocent XI. did not love the Jesuits, and wished to change their Institute. He was a great and holy Pontiff, but inflexible even to harshness, jealous of his rights even to obstinacy, and impracticable when his authority was in question. In the affair of the Regale, the Jesuits had shown themselves more French than Roman. He had sent them his briefs, which the Parliament suppressed, with orders to publish them and certify their authenticity. The Jesuits remained neuter, *et ne voulurent pas se rendre impossibles en France en s'opposant aux lois du royaume.* He had even entrusted to P. Dez a brief of excommunication against Louis XIV., but the Jesuit took care not to publish it. He kept it secret, to leave the Pope time for reflection; and in fact Innocent XI. withdrew it himself, acknowledging in the end how wise had been the

¹ Vol. i. pp. 294—296.

We are not going here to reduce and adjust these rival extravagances; but it may be said, that to fair examination, the truth does not seem to lie very deep.

If we look into its history, its first cause is to be sought in the inherited habits of thought, which had been formed in the middle age schools. The extravagant licence of speculating and deciding had passed from doctrine to questions of morality and conscience; it was the fashion and mania of the day; serious men competed in the hardihood and strangeness of their solutions, and good men seemed to take a pride in finding out how much they could allow—in speculation at any rate—to be lawful. Conditions, restrictions, distinctions multiplied of course; but so did the authorities and decisions, inventing doubts, extending liberty, and taking away scruples. It is all done in these countless folios of Moral Theology, just as if it had no more to do with real human action than with the movements of the stars—all for the mere pleasure of speculating, and with the zest of a race in avoiding a corner, and the inventiveness of a legal debate, in pressing or giving the slip to the letter of an Act of Parliament.

Its next cause was the practical needs of casuistry—the endeavour to fix what cannot be fixed, the limits, in every possible case, of mortal sin. Casuistry may be a natural growth of the wants of conscience, and its place in a system like that of Rome is obvious. Whether it can supply those wants or not, the attempt to do so may doubtless be made with fairness and soberness; and it is impossible to doubt the ability or religious mind of many, whose meditations it has engaged. Such, in spite of Pascal, were Suarez and Vasquez. But its extent and its utility are limited; and the mischief of which it may be the occasion is obvious, if it becomes formal, or attempts to supersede or overshadow the individual conscience. And this tendency was plainly visible even in the best writers of the class. Doubtless moral questions are very important and often very hard ones. But there are endless questions on which no answer can be given except a bad one,—which cannot be answered in the shape proposed at all. We may think it very desirable to be able to state in the abstract, yet for practical use, the extreme cases, which excuse killing, or taking what is not our own; but if we cannot get beyond decisions, which leave the door open for unquestionable murders or thefts, or shut it only by vague verbal restrictions, unexplained and inexplicable, about '*prudence*,' and '*moderation*,' and '*necessity*,' and '*gravity of circumstances*,' it is a practical illustration of the difficulty of casuistry, which seems to point out, that unless we can do better,

we had best leave it alone. But these men were hard to daunt. They could not trust the consciences of mankind with principles of duty, but they could trust without a misgiving their own dialectic forms, as a calculus which nothing could resist. Nothing in the feelings or actions of men was too fleeting, too complicated, too subtle to be grasped, analysed, expressed and laid up for use, by means of the verbal technicalities of their method. No question would they dismiss as insoluble or absurd.

The consequence was twofold. Their method often *did* fail, and in the attempt to give exact formulæ of right and wrong action, they proved unable to express the right without comprehending the wrong with it. Then as it was not their way to reopen and reexamine, they were driven on that strange maxim for a practical philosophy, that much might be lawful in speculation which was unlawful in practice. They did not shrink from consequences; but they, or at least their defenders, took refuge in the alleged unfairness of taking them at their word. But it is scarcely possible to believe that this scientific impotence was the only consequence of their misdirected labour. From all evil designs the leaders, at any rate, may be safely absolved; though whether they did not lose their sense of the reality of human action, in the formal terms in which they contemplated it, may be a question. But though the *design* of corrupting morality is one of the most improbable charges against any men, the *effect* may more easily follow, even where not intended. When great authorities lay down conclusions which seem to relax the strength of obligation, man must cease to be the creature of affected self-deceit and mixed character, which we know him to be, if any verbal guarding can save them from misleading him—misleading under the pretence of obedience. These Casuists would not trust the individual conscience; and it had its revenge. They were driven onwards till they had no choice left between talking nonsense, or what was worse. They would ticket, and control, and provide for the most evanescent and mixed forms of will and feeling. They would set conscience to rights in minutest detail; and so they had to take the responsibility of whatever could not be set to rights. Nature outwitted them; it gave up its liberty in the gross, and then forced them to surrender it again in detail. They claimed to lay down exactly the measure and shape of every form of stealing; so whenever the letter of their rules did not hold there was no stealing. Nay, it made them avowedly allow for its waywardness in the rules they laid down, as the price of its submission to control at all. And thus, at length, under the treatment of compilers and abridgers, and under the influence of

that idea of authority, which deferred to *opinions*¹ on the same rule as it deferred to *testimony*,—exhibited in the coarsest brevity, and with the affectation of outbidding the boldest precedents,—grew up that form of casuistry which is exhibited in the Escobars and Baunys; which professing to be the indispensable aid to common sense, envelopes it in a very Charybdis of discordant opinions; amid whose grotesque suppositions, and whimsical distinctions, and vague yet peremptory rules, bandied about between metaphysics and real life, the mind sinks into a hopeless confusion of moral ideas, and loses every clue to simple and straightforward action.

A modern reader is more disposed to see in it mere stupid pedantry than mischief. Able and serious men of the time, on the other hand, were revolted in seeing stupid pedantry pretending to be the guide of human conduct, and showing itself off as the latest invention of modern wisdom. Doubtless both views may be exaggerated. The system may have done good in its earlier and healthier state; possibly it may also have been too antiquated and worn out to do evil in its subsequent formal overgrowth. If it is said to have been too absurd to be important, we can understand if we do not accept the view. But it is asking a hard thing to beg us to believe, as M. Maynard does, *both* that these decisions were harmless, *and* that, with a few exceptions, they were very wise; both that they had a practical use and effect, and yet were not mischievous. If it can be made out that they are *only* matter for laughing, we are quite as much inclined to laugh as to be indignant; but if we are to be serious about them, there is only one way of being so.

One point more remains to be noticed. An old writer tells us that '*cæcitalis due species facile concurrunt, ut qui non vident quæ sunt, videre videantur quæ non sunt.*' The remark is singularly borne out here. So convinced is M. Maynard of the evil of the Jansenist doctrine and system of direction, in exacting so much and such strict preparation for absolution and communion, and insisting so strongly on their uselessness and danger without a real change of life, *that in one way only can he account for it.*²

¹ 'Une opinion probable est celle qui a un fondement considérable. Or l'autorité d'un homme savant et pieux n'est pas de petite considération, mais plutôt de grande considération. Car si le témoignage d'un tel homme est de grand poids pour nous assurer qu'une chose se soit passée, par exemple à Rome, pourquoi ne le sera-t-il pas de même dans un doute de morale.'—Sanchez, quoted in Prov. V., vol. i. p. 240.

For instance, he quotes from S. Cyran,—'Pour recevoir le sacrement de l'Eucharistie, il faut être en état de grâce, avoir fait pénitence de ses péchés, et n'être pas attaché, ni par volonté ni par négligence, à aucune chose qui puisse déplaire à Dieu.' 'Ceux qui demeurent volontairement dans les moindres fautes et imperfections sont indignes du sacrement de l'Eucharistie;' with passages recommending

It is impossible, it appears to him, that men could state the claims of religion so rigorously, except for one object, *to drive men to refuse them altogether*. Accordingly, he comes to the conclusion, that Jansenius, S. Cyran, and Arnould were *disguised infidels*; and labours to show, from a story of the time, coupled with their otherwise inexplicable severity, that Port-Royal was a deistical plot, as a Jesuit of the day expressed it, *'to ruin the mystery of the Incarnation, to make the Gospel pass for an apocryphal story, to exterminate the Christian religion, and to raise up Deism on the ruins of Christianity.'*

Such is the only way in which M. Maynard can explain the appearance in the seventeenth century, in his own communion, of the austere language of the Fathers of the Church. And this is not a passing insinuation. As P. Brisacier assured the Jansenists that he called them *'gates of hell and pontiffs of the devil,'* not *'par forme d'injure, mais par la force de la vérité,'* so M. Maynard maintains, in a special essay¹ of sixteen closely printed pages, the high historical probability of the Jansenist plot of Bourg-Fontaine, for the annihilation of Christianity. *'Si l'axiome de logique,'* he says, *'ab actu ad posse valet illatio, peut trouver ici son application, au doit conclure qu'il est au moins fort possible que le dessein de détruire le Christianisme ait été pris à Bourg-Fontaine, car les différents points qui l'auraient composé ont été essayés par S. Cyran et ses disciples; voilà qui est incontestable.'* *'Pour conclure en un mot; des preuves indirectes et rétroactives semblent établir la réalité du projet de Bourg-Fontaine; des preuves péremptoires démontrent que la foi de Port-Royal sur les Sacrements, sur l'Eucharistie, sur l'Eglise, et sur l'essence même du Christianisme, étaient au moins suspectes. Quand même ils se seraient trompés sur quelques points, les Jésuites n'étaient ni téméraires ni calomnieux dans leurs accusations.'*² *'Le croyez-vous vous-mêmes, misérables que vous êtes?'* was Pascal's indignant challenge to his opponents then, and it is the only one worth giving at any time.

This reminds us that we have spent more time than enough on M. Maynard. Some of that famous order of which he has made himself the champion, might afford him precedents in deliberately arguing for moral paradoxes. P. Hardouin comprised Pascal in his list of Atheists. P. Raynauld proved a

the newly converted, or those guilty of some special sin, to abstain for a time from communion. On this M. Maynard can only put the construction, *'Traduction libre mais exacte de tous ces passages; "ne communiez jamais, car vous en êtes et en serez toujours indignes."*'—Vol. ii. pp. 219, 220.

¹ Introd. à la 16me Provinc. vol. ii. pp. 215—231.

² Vol. ii. pp. 218, 231.

heresy in every article of the Apostles' Creed. But, one of them, at least, probably both, did it in joke. M. Maynard has forgotten Scaliger's wise saying, *Ars est etiam maledicendi*. The most determined enemy of S. Cyran or Arnauld, who at this day affected to doubt their *Tridentine* faith about Penance and the Eucharist, would peril his character for candour; but the man who gravely pretends to maintain, and asks us to believe, that they were deliberate infidels, is far past criticism. He might as well prove that they had horns and tails.

Here we take our leave of him. Yet he has laid us under an obligation. He has realized to us—no longer, indeed, in an unsuspicious and communicative, but in an irritated mood—the Jesuit father of the Provincial Letters, a well-meaning man, and as far as possible from purposing any harm, but dulled into a positive incapacity for perceiving that there is any harm in what is wrong, if his friends say it.

But, after all, this man is but a blind and injudicious repeater,—seduced into print by that cheap gift which Frenchmen have, a plausible and flimsy rhetoric,—of the views and assertions of De Maistre,¹—of that fashionable theory concerning the Roman Church, which itself does what is its heaviest and justest charge against opponents of that Church—prefer to call good evil, rather than submit to be checked and controlled by facts. He but follows the stream, and talks, as he can, the fearless sophistry which he hears admired. But we cannot congratulate the French Church, if he is an average specimen of the men who are promoted to her titular dignities, set over the education of her dioceses,² and encouraged to publish by the 'favourable opinion of the highest ecclesiastical authority existing in France.'

¹ V. De Maistre, de l'Eglise Gallicane; the parallel between Hobbes and Jansenius.

² 'Appelé à travailler auprès de vous à la grande œuvre de l'éducation.'—*Dedication to the Bishop of Agen*.

NOTICES.

A PRETTY edition of 'Wilson's Sacra Privata,' (Cleaver,) with ritual notes, has been published as a companion to 'Wilson on the Lord's Supper,' illustrated on a similar plan. The notes in either work are replete with learning and curious research; occasionally they give exaggerated importance to circumstances of a local and temporary character; but within the same compass it would be difficult to find more information on the order and ceremonial practice of the Church of England.

'English Alice,' by A. J. Evelyn, Esq. (Pickering,) is 'A Poem, in Five Cantos.' Mr. Evelyn assures us that in Seville of the present day the Inquisition is in full force, and hands off young English ladies to dungeons, where their joints are wrenched and racked just as in Foxe's Martyrs. We give a specimen of the poetry: Scene, the dungeons of the Inquisition: 'It'—viz. 'the judge's cold and hissing tone'—

'It says, "Clerk, once more ask the prisoner this,—"
For a young secretary had his seat
Below the judge, sleek, slim, and grimly neat,—
"Will she confess the details of the flight,"' &c.

The intervention at the heroine's critical moment is in a high style of art, just as English Alice is about to be 'hurled' into the torture-chamber:—

'A lacquey enters in disorder'd haste—
"How now?" exclaims the judge; "whence this ill-placed
Intrusion?" "Sir, the English Consul stands
Without, and instant liberty demands
Of entrance."—"Then we'll go to him—remove
The prisoner."—"Nay, most courteous judge,"' &c.

'The English Consul' is not to be taken in—he quotes Cromwell—all hearts tremble—the Inquisition collapses, and it is a satisfaction to know that

'Alice is free! and walks secure from harm,
Beneath the ægis of her country's arm.'

'Gilbert Arnold' (Bentley) is a smart little book in green and gold. It appears to be an exaggerated advertisement of the Sermons preached in S. Paul's, Covent Garden.

'The Divine Master,' (Masters,) is somewhat more ambitious in language than suits our own taste; but it is a work which will doubtless attract. The sustained dialogue between the Soul and the 'Divine Master' is not, we think, the happiest, or indeed the safest, mode of conveying devotional instruction: it leads to an occasional lowering of the subject; in the way of composition, a prolonged metaphor becomes cold. But there can be no question of the good intentions of this writer: while we may reasonably differ on the minor qualifications of style and expression.

Professor Rymer Jones has published the second volume of his delightful 'Natural History of Animals,' (Van Voorst.) The scientific merits of this work—we may say the same of the Series with which it is connected—are undoubtedly great: but what we most admire is the kind, loving, sympathising relation towards God's lower creatures which they encourage and display. Natural History so treated becomes almost a domestic history—a set of family and biographical memoirs.

From the same publisher we have received the first seven parts of a new series of the 'Instrumenta Ecclesiastica,' published under the auspices of the Ecclesiological Society. We are not sure that in practical utility this collection does not surpass its well-known predecessors. We especially select Parts IV. and V. for Colonial use: a copy of these drawings of a Wooden Church would save a Colonial diocese hundreds of pounds, and a greater consumption of failure and disappointment. The series is executed with great delicacy; and not only with a firm grasp of the ancient spirit of design, but with as clear a view of the necessity of adapting old forms and feeling to modern requirements. If 'Ecclesiology' were once, and, perhaps, not altogether unjustly, charged with pedantry, it is a satisfaction to find its later developments so eminently practical. Indeed, the mere archaeological merits of this series are among their least important recommendations.

While we are chronicling second volumes and continuations, we desire to record 'The Conquerors of the New World and their Bondsmen,' (Pickering,) of which we spoke favourably on the appearance of the first volume. We repeat this commendation to its successor.

We do not go to the extent of acquiescing in all Mr. Charles Smith's 'Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Creed of the Church of Rome,' (J. W. Parker,) of which the third part has just appeared, 'on the Mass and Transubstantiation.' But we must say that the series is full of thought, and embodies a deep and full appreciation of the mysteries of the Christian kingdom. Mr. Smith seems to represent, or to recal, the school of H. More and his Cambridge followers. We cannot think the study of the subject complete without reference to these able and original publications.

Mr. Dowell's 'Catechism on the Services of the Church of England,' (Rivingtons,) is full, and laborious, and sound.

Mr. Murray's cheap series, 'Railway Reading,' has received many pleasant instalments. Lady Eastlake's 'Music and Dress;' pleasant at the close of the London season. 'The Honey Bee;' quite a summer book, and to be read with summer accompaniments. 'The Flower Garden;' equally seasonable. 'Oliphant's Journey to Nepal;' one of the very best of the series, and one which will serve to show holiday travellers what in the great unexplored East still awaits them. To commend again what everybody commends, is tedious, if necessary.

'The Jubilee Year of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel,' (Bell,) has, and very successfully, reached its second edition, enriched with the contributors' names. It is a graceful memorial of a memorable occasion.

'Outlines of Ecclesiastical History,' (J. W. Parker,) by Mr. W. H. Hoare. In small manuals of this kind, verbal and minute accuracy is everything.

We regret that Mr. Hoare has not superintended the press. At p. 19 we read of 'Praxeas, Nætus, and Beryllus,'—at p. 54 we find Nestorius advanced before the Catholic Church, and the 'Eutycheans' enjoying the same preference. This work is founded a good deal on Dean Waddington's Ecclesiastical History.

Mr. Pott's 'Confirmation Lectures, preached at Cuddesden,' (Masters,) are above the average.

'Oremus,' (Rivingtons,) we fear, is a collection below the average even of religious verses.

M. Cely Trevilian, Esq.—is the second name the archaic form of *silly*?—has, in his 'Examination of the sign $\chi\xi\tau$, Rev. xiii. 18,' (Binns and Goodwin,) discovered the Beast of the Apocalypse in Louis Napoleon. 666, we are assured, means 6,000,000; but the President was elected by six millions; therefore the President is the Beast. Q.E.D. Not content with this notable discovery, Mr. Trevilian goes further: in a very tantalizing way, after having so satisfactorily disposed of $\chi\xi\tau$, he assures us that after all the sign is not $\chi\xi\tau$ but $\xi\tau$ = 60.10.6., which looks very like 76. But this would not suit Mr. Trevilian, who wanted to juggle 1066 out of it, which, by some cabalistical process, he says means Louis Napoleon. But how to get 1066 out of 60.10.6.? Why, says Mr. Trevilian, by making the middle figure the most important; just as over 'a shop door, you read *Silversmith Payne Jeweller*,' p. 17. Actually all this is in print; and as a clincher to the argument, the prominence given to the figure 10 signifies the 10 May. We commit arithmetic and numerical signs to Mr. Trevilian: the truths of numbers can avenge themselves: to be told that six hundred is only a form of six millions requires no reprobation. But why should Mr. Trevilian play cabalistical tricks with grammar and the doctrine of gender: cannot he leave the poor Graces alone? why does he talk of (p. 27):—

'Vultus non omnibus una?'

We can hardly keep pace with the publications which multiply upon us, upon the engrossing question of Synodical action, and the admission of the lay element into Church assemblies; that both these subjects may be discussed with temper and judgment, is our sincere wish. But since at the present moment even the expression of opinion has its dangers, we content ourselves with announcing, 1. 'Synodal Action necessary to the Church:' a letter to Mr. Gladstone, by Mr. Caswall, (Mozley.) 2. 'Suggestions for practically carrying out the Principle of Lay Cooperation in the Synods of the Scottish Church,' (Aberdeen: Brown.) 3. 'The Law, Constitution, and Reform of Convocation,' (J. H. Parker.) 4. 'Some Objections to the Revival of Ecclesiastical Synods answered, by Mr. G. D. Wheeler,' in a University Sermon, (J. H. Parker.) 5. 'Church Synods the Institution of Christ,' a Sermon preached in York Minster, by Mr. George Trevor, (Bell.) 6. Archdeacon Sinclair's 'Charge' (Rivingtons,) against Synodal action. 7. 'The Appeal to Convocation:' Archdeacon Wilberforce's Charge, (Murray.)

Mr. W. R. Scott, a name new to us, has printed a very promising pamphlet, 'A reply to Mr. Goode,' (Masters,) on the necessity of the Episcopal question. Archdeacon Churton and Mr. Harington have left something yet to glean in this field of discussion; and Mr. W. B. Flower, in his 'Non-Episcopal Orders: a Letter to Mr. Goode,' (Masters,) on the same subject, has completed the discussion with vigour and freeness. Mr. Goode,

nothing daunted, and always ready to pick a quarrel with everybody, and to take for a personality every hint at heterodoxy, advertises a 'Letter to Sir W. P. Wood, on the acceptance of the Prayer Book in a non-natural sense.' The assertion was general enough: has Mr. Goode his especial reasons for making the taunt a personal one?

To Mr. Jebb we are indebted for an earnest 'Plea for what is left of the Cathedrals, &c.' (Rivingtons.) It was directly called out by Lord Blandford's Bill: but the occasion or the necessity for some such protest has not passed away. The fate of capitular corporations is curious enough. When, ten or twenty years ago, Church Reform was the order of the day, Churchmen saw that the only hope for the Chapters was in making them useful. This purpose has been defeated from that day to this by those who are now most clamorous against Cathedrals. If it was the policy of the Whigs to destroy Cathedrals and stalls by filling them with unworthy incumbents, they have gone far to succeed.

'What are the best Means of Reclaiming our lost Population?' (Leeds: Harrison,) is the authoritative Report of Suggestions made by the Leeds Clergy on the division of services, and other practical measures, which, when first made, attracted much attention, and, in some not unnecessary particulars, much criticism.

'Specimens of Old Indian Poetry,' translated from the Sanskrit, by Mr. Griffith, Boden Scholar, (Hall, Virtue & Co.) is the work of one who is a perfect master of metre and language. If, as we have no reason to doubt, its fidelity is equal to its force and English style, we may pronounce Mr. Griffith's 'Specimens' a distinct and important contribution to English literature.

'The Emphatic New Testament,' by Mr. John Taylor, (Taylor, Walton & Co.) is an attempt to mark the emphasis and relative value of each word by a system of corresponding differences in type. Practically this amounts to a kind of pictorial commentary; since it is obvious that interpretation turns on emphasis. In proportion to the skill displayed in the execution of this task—and we are not disparaging the pains bestowed on it—are the controversial difficulties which it involves. The obvious objection to the principle of such a work is, that it confines the sense to a single emphasis;—*ex. grat.* The Lord's Prayer: everybody feels that one of the blessings belonging to this prayer is the variety and succession of emphases—that is, of successive and parallel senses and applications of which it admits. Mr. Taylor's attempt, of course, practically excludes all meanings but one.

Perhaps the most important book of the quarter is Mr. Cleveland Cox's 'Sympathies of the Continent, or Proposals for a New Reformation,' (J. H. Parker.) The body of this work consists of a translation of Hirscher's 'Present Crisis of the Church,' with parallel illustrations from contemporaneous French and Italian works. Dr. Hirscher is a Roman Catholic, a dignitary of Freiburg, Breisgau, and a writer of large and European reputation. His proposition is for another Reformation: he goes very deeply into the practical necessities of the Church, especially those arising from its separation from the State. But we may perhaps state the drift of the work best in its author's own words: 'A third point to which the Church must direct its immediate attention, is the satisfaction of that general

'chemical *intermèdes*, which are capable of producing a union between elements dissociable in themselves.' So wrote the Count de Maistre, a close observer of the Continental Protestants, and of the Russo-Greek Church; but one of the most bigoted Ultramontanists that ever strove to make the worse appear the better reason in behalf of Rome! Perhaps he said it "not of himself." It was written before the present century opened, and what sign of such a *movement* existed then? But now, when we find "deep calling unto deep"—religious movement characterising the whole Church; and all that is not unreal and re-actionary, setting towards one result, it becomes England and English Christians to recognise this noble mission of their Church. Is not the *movement* which now agitates her, the expected beginning of better things for the world? It is certainly a Catholic movement in its spirit and tendencies, and coincides with that which has been already characterised, as it exists in Hirscher. It sets not towards Rome; but, far beyond Rome and Mediævalism, it seeks after the primitive and the pure. So far from being papal, it is, in a good sense, popular. While Mediævalism runs counter to all the habits and principles of the English race, wherever it is found, this movement, like Hirscher's, seeks to meet the wants and instincts of men in society, and to adapt itself to the condition of the world. Instead of isolating the priesthood, and keeping the laity at a distance, it breathes the genuine spirit of ancient Catholicity, in its philanthropy, its sympathy for the masses, and its desire to employ the mighty energies of the people in honourable services and holy undertakings. With all its divine right and high conservatism, it yet understands the popular element, and knows how to produce harmonious action between it, and what is exclusively sacerdotal. It is impossible that this movement should not be highly popular with Englishmen, when once it is purified from the obloquy and the defilement which have befallen it, through the morbid enthusiasm of some who have shared its earliest and most dangerous excitements.'—Pp. 48—50.

'The Eclipse of Faith,' (Longman,) is a very remarkable book. It is a reply—and an adequate reply—to Mr. Francis Newman's recent 'Phases of Faith:' and to the mysticism of the new school of spiritualizing infidelity. The argument is conducted with great skill, it combines the true Socratic irony with the Socratic dialogue. There is wit, too, as well as wisdom in the discussion: and though the writer—Mr. Rogers, of the 'Edinburgh Review'—holds views different on many important matters from our own, we must award him the honour of a distinguished defence of revelation in the present work—a work in which depth of thought is relieved by great clearness and force of style.

We sympathise with the purpose of the series of Tracts proposed on 'The Restoration of Belief,' (Cambridge: Macmillan,) and, as far as the first number brings them out, with the immediate objects and method of their writers. But we cannot reconcile ourselves to a more decisive commendation of what is necessarily, at present, so undeveloped.

'Evenings at Sackville College,' (Masters,) announces its character. It is a collection of 'Legends for Children.' To this there would be no objection were all the narratives simply fictitious, but they lay claim to various degrees of credibility: and the last, 'by way of contrast,' is the Bedminster

tions, 'done into choice English.' Besides this, it has a sensible introduction, and a close analysis. The translations of the interspersed hexameters are cleverly rendered in the corresponding metre.

Archdeacon Wilberforce's Charge, 'The Appeal to Convocation,' (Mozleys,)—we have previously alluded to its reference to Convocation and the question of Synods—contains some reflections on practical matters which are important. On Church-rates he takes, we think, a sensible line:—

'None of us, probably, will deny, however strange it may appear to ourselves, that there may be persons who are sincerely opposed to the Church to which reason and habit has attached us. But whatever sentiments may have prevailed at other times, or in other countries, it is to be hoped that there are few Englishmen in the nineteenth century who would wish to coerce the consciences of others. It follows that, whatever be the religious opinions of our fellow-countrymen, they must be allowed to enjoy the protection of those equal laws which secure our persons and property. Now, it may be questioned how far this is consistent with the practice of calling upon men to take an active part in maintenance of a faith which they believe to be erroneous. It is true, of course, that those who purchase a property have no right to complain of the deductions to which they know it to be incident: if a man buys only 9-10ths of an estate, he has only 9-10ths of it. But this merely implies that the Church has a right to such payments as depend upon the active support of former benefactors; it does not fully meet the question of church-rates, as levied in the present day. The ancient law requires all persons who occupy houses or lands to assemble and to tax themselves for the maintenance of their parish church, and for the expenses of public worship. Now, it is one thing that these objects should be defrayed at the public expense; and another, that every individual should be called upon, by his own vote, to affirm their propriety. Even dissenters might think it desirable that a church should be provided for the poor, though they do not themselves frequent it, and Churchmen, on the other hand, might claim to retain rights which had been once conceded to them, without choosing to appeal to the liberality of Separatists. But the peculiarity of a church-rate is this—that, though imposed by the general law of the land, it yet requires the personal cooperation of every individual. Various members of Parliament have lately declared that they will give no vote for bestowing any additional grant on the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth, but that they feel reluctant to touch existing endowments. Here you see the principle out of which the cry against church-rates has arisen. If churches were endowed with a certain sum for their sustentation, or if they had in any way a claim upon the public purse, there would be no appearance of an individual grievance; but you call all dwellers in the parish together, you require them to levy a tax upon themselves for the maintenance of the fabric, and the supply of the sacramental elements, though they are allowed to deny the utility of public worship, and the validity of sacraments. And if it be asked how this anomaly has arisen, the answer is the same as before. The objector can hardly wonder that the ecclesiastical laws make no allowance for his opinions, since they take no note of his existence. To make rates, and to be eligible as Church-wardens, are correlative facts; the same circumstance which entitles a

' Church. The error is not an unnatural one, considering that the changes in the aspect of our political heavens have been as gradual as they have complete. At present, however, Parliament expresses the minds of nearly 30 millions of our fellow-countrymen, of whom not above a third are nominally members of our Church. How, then, can it stand in the same relation to us as when none could be a voter or a legislator who was not a communicant? But this will never be practically felt till a body exists which occupies the same place which was once occupied by Parliament. Neither can it be any sacrifice of principle that the lay representatives of our communicants should concur in public measures so long as they are ready to admit—as Parliament formerly did—that if "any cause of the law divine happened to come in question," or of spiritual learning, it ought to be "declared interpreted, and showed, by that part of the body politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church.'"—Pp. 21—23.

And also on the general subject of our changing relations to Parliament:—

' It is obvious enough how this has happened, and how injurious is its effect, both to the clergy and the Church. We have two sets of laws—one civil, the other ecclesiastical; one created by Parliament, the other by Convocation. The principle of our civil laws has been entirely changed during the last two centuries. First came the Toleration Act, in 1688; then the Union with Scotland, in 1706; lastly, the repeal of the Test Act, in 1828, and that of Roman Catholic Disabilities, in 1829. The effect of these alterations has been not only to give the most perfect legal toleration to men of all opinions, but to cut asunder the relations by which the Church was formerly bound to the ruling power of this realm. This is the necessary result, whether good or evil, of giving power to the mass of the people, while the people are divided in religious opinions. But, while this change has been going on in our civil laws, our ecclesiastical laws have remained wholly unaltered. They continue to take it for granted that the constitution of this country does not allow any person to be an Englishman who is not also a Churchman. They make no provision for any other case. They deal with the clergy as though this were truly the state of things. And hence results a mass of fictions and anomalies, injurious in many ways to all parties; but by which the Church herself is incomparably the greatest sufferer. Her own formularies declare the due use of ecclesiastical discipline to be a criterion of a true Church. And why, then, is it abandoned? Because to acknowledge changes which it was impossible to avoid, is thought a greater evil than to retain laws, which it is impossible to execute. The Court, at which we are at present assembled, is held for the professed purpose of enforcing ecclesiastical discipline. Now, there are two principles on which it might be grounded. When the State and the Church are identical, as they were in England in the reign of

¹ ' Should a house of lay-representatives ever be united to Convocation, there are two rules which must be laid down as fundamental principles of their incorporation, unless we are prepared to give up our claim to be a part of the ancient Church Catholic: first, that all questions which involve doctrine should be decided by the Spirituality; secondly, that it should belong to the Spirituality to determine what questions do, and what do not, involve doctrine. This would leave to the laity that secular part of ecclesiastical affairs, which our ancient constitution assigned to Parliament.'

* Elizabeth, Church discipline can be enforced by temporal penalties. When
 * the State and the Church are not identical, as before the time of Constan-
 * tine, it can only be maintained by allowing the Church to act as an inde-
 * pendent corporation, and to exercise authority over her own voluntary
 * members. But the Church of England can neither adopt the one principle
 * nor the other. She cannot act as a voluntary corporation, because her
 * laws assume that she is identical with the State. She cannot employ the
 * principle of coercion, because she is not really identical with it. So that
 * she has the incumbrances of State succour without its benefits; her
 * responsibilities are measured by one rule, her jurisdiction by another.

* That the evil referred to is not a visionary one is shown by the wide
 * dissatisfaction recently manifested among the clergy. In a Letter of the
 * 13th February, 1852, the Archbishop of Canterbury says that he has lately
 * communicated "to a large assembly of bishops, the memorial respecting
 * the burial service, signed by 4,000 clergy. The bishops," he adds, "gene-
 * rally sympathise with the memorialists in the difficulties to which they
 * sometimes find themselves exposed with reference to the terms of that
 * service. But I am sorry to report further," he concludes, "that the
 * obstacles in the way of remedying those difficulties, appear to them, as at
 * present advised, to be insuperable." Now, it is obvious, as his Grace
 * says, that the difficulty cannot be remedied by any act of their lordships,
 * however deeply they may feel the hardships which it frequently inflicts.
 * And cases have occurred in this Riding, as well as elsewhere, which would
 * sufficiently exhibit it. For there can be no cure so long as we keep up
 * a law which is adapted, like the 68th canon, to a state of circumstances
 * which no longer exists. This canon was passed two centuries and a half
 * ago, when no such thing as dissent was tolerated in England. The state
 * of our civil law at that period may be understood from the fact, that four
 * years after it had been enacted, Whiteman was burned at Lichfield, and
 * Legate at Smithfield, for denying the Trinity. Can we wonder that the
 * rules which had their origin in such a system of law, are inapplicable to our
 * present position? Would our militia fight with advantage if they were
 * restricted from the employment of every weapon which has come into use
 * since the invention of gunpowder? Yet this rule was passed by Convo-
 * cation, and by Convocation only can it be amended. It touches upon
 * spiritual questions, with which no other body in the country is competent
 * to deal. For it can hardly be thought decent that the internal affairs
 * of the Church should be discussed by the Roman Catholic or dissenting
 * members of Parliament. So that either we must appeal to the Church's
 * assembly, or we must continue under the grievances and anomalies from
 * which it has power to relieve us.—Pp. 14—16.

Of Sermons we have to put on record, 1. 'The Temptation of our Blessed
 Lord; a series of Lectures by Mr. T. Tunstall Smith,' (Hatchard.) 2. 'Life
 and Death;' some affecting Discourses by Mr. C. C. Spencer, (Cleaver.)
 3. 'Sermons, addressed to a Country Congregation;' carefully prepared for
 their specialties by Mr. E. T. Codd, (Masters.) 4. 'The Revelations of
 Astronomy; by Mr. Steel, preached at Harrow School,' (J. W. Parker.)
 5. 'Our Founder's Claim; preached on S. Barnabas' Day, at S. Barnabas,
 Pimlico, by Mr. Skinner,' (Hayes,) which contains a recognition, neither
 tardy nor grudging, of Mr. Bennett's zeal and successes.

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1852.

ART. I.—1. *A Voyage to Iceland.* By MADAME IDA PFEIFFER.
London: Bentley.

2. *A Woman's Journey Round the World.* Illustrated London
Library.

It is not possible to read many books of travels, without falling into a course of reflection on the various qualities necessary to make a good traveller, which mankind in general are without, or possess in a very limited degree; and if our cogitations are pursued far enough, arriving at the conclusion, that many of these qualities are of an order and strength so different from what are needed by stayers at home, that we must consider travelling a providential calling, inasmuch as these gifts would be nothing short of a hindrance and a snare if not allowed their appropriate exercise. The powers and faculties which constitute an efficient traveller might, from misdirection, be wearying, or even repelling in our home friends and intimate acquaintance. There is so manifest a fitness between the man and his work, that we can wish him no other destiny, nor ourselves a closer familiarity. The more he is suited for his vocation, the less we desire to see him in any other. In fact, the man whose home is the world, has no other home, either in visible space, or in the heart of man.

To review some of these qualities. Unflagging energy is noble, but often a snare to its possessor without a wide enough field for its exertions; ceaseless curiosity, a praiseworthy instinct so long as there are objects worthy to engage it; health, courage and endurance are excellent gifts if not brought into ostentatious comparison with feebler powers; indifference to personal ease and the conveniences of life, respectable, unless they make some domestic hearth uncomfortable. Again; toleration of the world's variety of habits and customs is amiable if it does not jar with the stricter rules of an organized society, and an expansive feeling of

benevolence fills us with admiration, till we are made alive to its tendency to check strong individual attachments. It is needless to pursue the catalogue of wayfaring virtues which, in any disproportionate development, point out some of our fellows, either as pioneers of civilization leading their less adventurous brothers to fresh fields and pastures new; or as links to draw together, for the benefit of all, nations and people whom prejudice and restrictions have hitherto held apart; or simply as faithful portrayers of those wonders and beauties of God's creation from which we are furthest removed, and to which personal access is denied us. And here the points of similarity, amid the essential differences of their avocations, suggest an analogy between the office of the traveller and the poet, so far as they are teachers and benefactors of their race. Both are sustained and led on by an irresistible impulse: the poet must speak or die; the man who thirsts to know and see all this earth has to show, alike feels it the end and purpose of his existence, and holds life itself well spent in the search.

'I cannot rest from travel, I will drink
Life to the lees. * *
For my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset and the baths
Of all the western stars until I die.
It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;
It may be we shall touch the happy isles.'

Both have for their object the vast field of man and nature, and are absorbed by these interests to the exclusion or neglect of personal and private ones. To each they must be the main pursuit of life; and both are separated by peculiar gifts and powers for their work. But here start the innumerable points of difference: for first, Imagination, all essential to the poet, the one indispensable gift, is so far from a necessity to the traveller, that the possession of it would at once check his own progress, and weaken our trust in him. If he could vividly picture the unseen to his mind, the passion for seeing with the actual vision would lose its intensity; if we could detect in him a free play of fancy, we should mistrust his reports to us.

'The light that never was by sea or land'

should not and does not illuminate his landscape. It is his merit, as it is his nature, to see things precisely as they are. No prejudices must warp his judgment, no associations interfere with the duty of impartial comparison. The poet is nobly prejudiced; his country, his birth-place, his home have an inalienable claim on his best love and warmest admiration; their characteristics influence all his ideas of beauty. The traveller's

unchartered freedom leaves him always at liberty to weigh and compare, to give up all he has seen for what he may see, to yield the palm to the new, over the most cherished past scene. And so far as he betrays a preference to his own country, as such, over any other that he visits, because it is his own, he loses his right to our confidence; or of his country's customs, as such, to others, which the course of his wanderings brings him amongst, we have to withdraw our implicit faith. But we yield ourselves up to the poet to be taught by him, to admire what he admires, to love what he loves, to be influenced by his prejudices, to share his associations. For we know that Nature waits upon him, that she reveals to him her secrets, that he possesses the key of her deepest meanings and most hidden sympathies, and therefore, though he has seen but one corner of her illimitable field, one grain of her great harvest, we feel that he is yet possessed of a higher truth concerning all, than our mere senses can attain to: and thus aided, easily, because with congenial labour, he gains his knowledge, while the traveller toils in the sweat of his brow, and in toiling, though he sees great things, loses the delicacy of his perceptions, and impairs the fineness of his instincts.

Their uses to ourselves too are different. The one sets before us as plainly and accurately as he can whatever is prominent, distinguished, or wonderful in the world,—all that most readily attracts attention, and takes the most forcible hold on the memory, and which, being remote, or at least beyond our reach, can only be known through his report. The use of the poet, on the contrary, is to awaken our too readily dulled perceptions to the beauty which lies around us in simple forms and most familiar combinations; which we are in danger of disregarding, because they are always before us, but which are the depositories—whether we search into them or not—of all our purest associations, as being the source of those first thoughts of wonder, love, and admiration that visited our childhood. He puts us in a frame to recal these recollections; he connects our past and present, and thus dignifies and exalts both; and through him the sweet sounds that greet us every day, instead of falling on deaf ears, are to us the ‘music of Paradise, for the heart listens;’ the fields that our eyes have rested on since they had power to rejoice in the sunshine, can excite in us moments of more intense emotion than all the magnificence of unfamiliar scenes, till for us too

‘Tears from the depth of some divine despair
Rise in the heart, and gather to the eyes,
In looking on the happy autumn fields,
And thinking of the days that are no more.’

'In half an hour we reached a valley, in the centre of which lay rather a pleasant meadow, with what might be considered in Iceland a very respectable farm-house, near a little lake. I did not venture to ask if this were the celebrated Vatne, and the romantic prospect I had been led to expect, for my inquiring would have sounded rather too ironical; and notwithstanding my astonishment when Mr. Von H—— insisted on all the charms of the scene, I enthusiastically agreed with him, and declared I had never seen a lovelier view, or a larger lake. We halted at this spot, and while the rest of the party spread themselves over the meadow, and preparations were going on for our sociable meal, I employed the time by endeavouring to satisfy my spirit of inquiry.'—P. 103.

But it is not fair to our authoress to dwell first upon what she is not, when there is so much to tell of what she is. Madame Ida Pfeiffer is a traveller in the fullest sense of the word. All the natural qualities which point men out for this vocation she has in such a preeminent degree, that we scarcely regret her total deficiency in many of the acquired ones. It only shows the more forcibly the strength of the original bias and the power of that irresistible impulse which leads some men, through any sacrifice and danger, to see for themselves, and to describe to others their own impressions and adventures. Her well-known work,—*'A Woman's Journey Round the World,'* though detailing events subsequent to those which form the subject of our article, has yet been so much longer before the English reader, that the period has passed for any lengthened notice; nor indeed was it necessary to call attention to a book so full of interest, and that of so very popular a character. But we must dwell for a moment on some of the leading traits of character which this volume brings to light. We have hitherto been accustomed to consider women incapable of the extremes of fatigue and bodily exertion. There are a number of feats of travel which it is supposed impossible for a woman to perform; which she has neither strength, nor courage, nor inclination for. The attractions at once, and the infirmities of her sex, seem to point her out rather to fulfil the part of Desdemona than Othello,—to drink in tales about the Anthropophagi, rather than to go in search of them. But Madame Pfeiffer is of another mind altogether, and as far as her individual example goes, has proved the utter fallacy of these suppositions. Inspired by one absorbing passion, there is nothing that she hears a report of but she longs to know it more fully, and no adventure that she undertakes that she has not sense and spirit to carry through. Her energy is not one step behind her curiosity. She has shown that she deliberately holds any new country, any natural wonder, well worth the risk of dying to see; and has proved at the same time that with such a temper of mind, her sex instead of a hindrance is a help, that—(though we are far from wishing the experiment repeated)—women are in a certain sense better

the rocks occupied her attention so much that she had no time for fear. In Tahiti, having heard of the native skill in making temporary boats at a few minutes' warning, she did not hesitate to trust herself to one, constructed by her guide of a few plantain branches tied together, in order to cross a lake to which he led her, and to allow herself to be propelled by him across, he swimming and she seated in the almost sinking bark. She runs the imminent risk of being stoned for the sake of seeing a Chinese garden, and very nearly incurs the same fate in her curiosity to see the manufacturing of tea. For the sight of a European woman excited such symptoms of dangerous animosity in the 600 workpeople of the establishment, that her conductor had earnestly to entreat her to forego the full inspection she had intended, and be content with a slight survey; and in consequence of this, 'she could only manage to observe that the 'leaves of the plant are thrown for a few seconds into boiling 'water, and then placed' &c. &c. In India, she is greatly delighted to receive an invitation to a tiger hunt, and though she owns to some alarms when a tiger on whom a shot had taken effect rushed maddened towards her, she kept herself so calm that none of the gentlemen had any knowledge of what was going on in her mind. And this curiosity is as indiscriminate as it is insatiable. She is almost as anxious to taste a new dish as to see a high mountain or a fine ruin. It leads her to inspect the dead-houses on the banks of the Hoogly, and the horrors by the side of the Ganges. She regrets that she has never been so lucky as to meet with dried grasshoppers as a favourite native dish. No prejudice prevents her giving an impartial and often a favourable judgment on the flavour of snakes and reptiles. This freedom from prejudice enabled her to carry out her rule of diet without so much discomfort as she would otherwise have endured.

'My rule in travelling is to exclude every kind of superfluity. Wherever I am certain to find people living, I take no eatables with me, for I can content myself with whatever they live upon. If I do not relish their food, it is a sign that I have not any real hunger, and I then fast till it becomes so great that any kind of dish is acceptable.—*A Woman's Journey Round the World*, p. 250.

A rule which she can adhere to even when she herself witnesses the preparation of the meal; and some of her details of Arab cookery are anything but inviting. And as nothing is too revolting, so nothing is too dry or technical to excite her interest; she considers herself indemnified for a provoking delay by which she was detained five days in Valparaiso, by the opportunity it afforded her of inspecting some fine collections of mussel shells and insects. But while this instinct never sleeps, it by no means obscures her judgment: her palate, for instance, never forgets

in fact, nothing can be really nasty that is cheap, and she finds a pleasure in detecting the failures which attended any more expensive modes of progress she might be forced to adopt.

In religion even this economic principle comes in. She had no objection on one occasion 'to afford a Bonze the gratification' of offering a lighted taper to his idol, and was only hindered from doing so by what she considered the injudicious zeal of the American Missionary, who attended her and told her it was idolatry; but she is really concerned at the quantity of oil unnecessarily consumed in China in keeping night lamps burning before their domestic altars, and it is not unlikely that the scale of expense on which the Missionaries wherever she went lived, according to her ideas of expense and luxury, may have inclined her to form the unfavourable view she has expressed of the extent and success of their labours. She would regard the profuse distribution of tracts and Bibles as a great outlay, and has quite a thrifty sympathy for liberal givers at home, whose money she thinks so recklessly laid out. We feel, indeed, that a person travelling in her manner and with her object, and not knowing the language of any country through which she passed, cannot and ought not to be regarded at all in matters which are beyond the reach of eyesight and superficial observation. Her proposal that Missionaries should always marry *native* wives wherever they are, as then neither wife nor child will be incommoded by the climate, proves her blunted perceptions on such subjects. But though incapable of discussing or understanding the religious bearings of any question, she is good authority on many moral points which show themselves more on the surface, especially on national manners towards dependents and inferiors, from which much may be inferred. She observes that the Chinese delight in tormenting animals, that the Hindoos are humane, that the English are bullying to the natives over whom they rule; the Arabs indulgent to their children, and in their turn obedient and dutiful to their parents; that the Tahitians in their transition, half savage state, have little feeling of any kind towards any person; that the Russians in their official capacity are, towards foreigners, the most rude and bearish of all Christian people. Here, however, prejudice probably steps in to give point to her impressions, but in every case, whether in trifles or matters of importance, she gives her own observations, what she has seen or been herself concerned in. The reader may believe her facts without being bound to her inferences or conclusions. She is proud of the independence of her judgment, of never being misled to undue praise by books or travellers' reports, of never indulging in second-hand enthusiasm, though she has the habit common with

attractive to me as books of travels; and ceasing to envy the postilions, I could not but repine at the happiness of every great navigator or discoverer, who could explore the yet unrevealed secrets of the natural world.

'Tears often rose to my eyes if, after climbing a hill, I found others towering up beyond my reach, and I could not see what lay concealed behind them. I travelled a great deal with my parents, and also with my husband after I was married, and it was not till my two boys were of an age to be sent to school that I remained stationary on their account.'—*Voyage to Iceland, Pref. p. vi.*

She then speaks of her first journey alone to Palestine, and concludes, after one of those little disclaimers against vanity which she often expresses, and which inevitably suggest some truth in the implied charge, with her reasons for selecting Iceland as her second theatre of adventure:—

'Iceland was a country where I hoped to behold nature under an aspect entirely new or peculiar. I feel so supernaturally happy, and draw so close to my Maker while gazing upon such scenes, that no difficulties or fatigues can discourage me from seeking so great a reward.

'Should death surprise me in any of my wanderings, I shall meet it with calmness, thanking God from my inmost heart for the blessed happy hours I have spent in admiring the wonders of His creation.'—*Ibid. Pref. p. viii.*

There is something sufficiently strange to the unadventurous part of the community in the strong attraction that the north possesses over many minds, and which is well figured in the very emblem of attraction, the loadstone, finding its home there. But coldness and desolation are in themselves inspiring from the exercise they give to powers which sleep in ease and comfort, so that in addition to her hope of seeing in Iceland 'a country 'peculiarly unblessed by nature, to which nothing similar is to be 'found on earth, what would fill her with new and unutterable 'astonishment,' this good lady, who knew of what tough materials she was made, probably had an unconscious longing to pitch her strength against the elements, and to prove what she could do.

She set out then from Vienna in 1845, and after some little time spent in Copenhagen, sailed for Iceland in the May of that year, and after eleven days, during which she was the victim of sea sickness, like any other mortal, reached Havenford, the haven of her hopes, some eight miles from Reikjavick, the real capital of Iceland, though in our school days we used to give Skalholt this name. In the preparations for her voyage for Copenhagen, and during her subsequent residence, she owed much to the attention of M. Knudson, a Danish gentleman, in deservedly high favour with travellers, and apparently the good genius of Iceland: for not only does Madame Pfeiffer profess herself indebted to him as the source of whatever kindness she received in the island, but we find a similar honourable mention of him by Mr. Barrow, who made the same expedition in 1834.

heard of the parties of pleasure, dinners, and evening entertainments, which were going on in the place. If I had not known how to occupy myself more profitably, time would have hung very heavily on my hands. It never seemed to occur to any of these ladies that I was a stranger, alone, and entirely debarred from all educated society. Of course, being no longer young, I felt I had no claims on the attention of the gentlemen: and the privation did not cost me much regret. If the women were wanting in consideration, I could not expect to find it in the men.

I pondered on the cause of this behaviour, till I discovered its social spring in the selfishness which is a striking characteristic of the people. As soon as I arrived in Reikjavick, diligent inquiries were made from all quarters, if I were rich, if I should entertain much company, or if there were anything to be gained by waiting upon me. Persons of large fortune, or great naturalists, are the only travellers who have a chance of being received well in Iceland.—*Ibid.* p. 74.

We give this passage, that our readers may be on their guard; for nothing so unfits a person for candid judgment as any sense of personal slight; and we think that in money matters Madame Pfeiffer is rather suspicious, and ready to cast national imputations on insufficient grounds. She makes much, for instance, of the lower class besieging her with specimens of lava, insects, or other poor rarities of their soil and climate, and asking unreasonable sums for them, as if this humble form of imposition were not common to human nature everywhere to be found, wherever collectors are willing to exchange current coin for objects of such mere conventional value that the ignorant may well be excused for thinking them all equally worthless, and the connoisseur as a person with more money than wit, and, therefore, a natural prey. We are not justifying this state of feeling: we only say it is universal, and what no country ought to be judged by.

Madame Pfeiffer criticises the gait and deportment of Icelandic ladies as characterised by a stiff second-hand coldness and hauteur which they have not real dignity to make natural. This demeanour is not unsuited to the aspect and architecture of their capital, which amongst pieces of formality and wooden stiffness must stand unrivalled. We judge not only from description, but from the sketches with which travellers furnish us. Except the church, there are but two stone buildings in the place. One was built for a prison, but crimes are so rare in Iceland, that the *Stiftsamtmann* has taken possession of it for his palace; the other is appropriately occupied by the bishop. The merchants' dwellings are all of wood, and consist of only one story. These stand side by side, with the separate uncomfortable distinctness of houses out of a toy-box, an effect which is probably inevitable where Nature has not vigour to take the works of man into her own keeping to adapt and adorn them, but has almost more than she can do in concealing the

ravages of her own wild freaks of desolating fury. Some houses have gardens attached to them; but few climates in the world are so unfavourable to horticulture; and a dish of potatoes, cabbages, or turnips, costs incredible pains in the rearing. Our countryman Mr. Barrow speaks tenderly of the pains a genuine garden-lover will take even under such adverse circumstances, and with so forbidding a climate. Success is always a relative thing; and it is possible even in Iceland to be proud of a garden.

'Radishes and turnip-radishes, mustard and cress, seemed to thrive the best in the governor's garden; but he bestowed much care and labour on his little piece of ground, and often took great pleasure in pointing out to me the healthy state and vigour of three or four plants of the mountain-ash, which (after I forget how many years' growth) had attained to the height of about four feet, and on the possession of which he prided himself not a little, assuring me that they were the largest, and, in fact, the only plants that deserved the name of trees within the distance of many miles round Reikjavick.'—*Barrow's Visit to Iceland*, p. 107.

Just such herbage and such gardens we may suppose the inhabitants of the moon to possess—if that the moon has inhabitants and gardens at all. There is something in the description of Iceland altogether that must remind those familiar with the maps of the moon which astronomers give us, of that rent and torn and convulsed little world, with its white peaks and dark hollows, and tracts between answering closely enough to the black lava-streams which give to Iceland its separate distinctive character, and make so strong an impression on the traveller.

In this country nature certainly should take precedence of man. We must, therefore, give our readers some of Madame Pfeiffer's descriptions of the scenes she had gone so far to witness, which are novel and striking enough. Before landing, she says:—

'My first impressions of the coast of Iceland were very different from the descriptions I had read in books. I had fancied a barren, desolate waste, without a bush or tree; and I saw grass-covered hillocks, copses, and even, as I thought, patches of dwarfish woods; but as we approached, and I could distinguish the different objects more plainly, the hillocks were changed into human habitations, with small doors and windows; and the groups of trees proved to be great lava-masses, from ten to fifteen feet high, entirely overgrown with grass and moss. Everything was new and surprising to me: I could hardly wait to land.'—*Voyage to Iceland*, p. 57.

A few hours enabled her to make a closer survey:—

'Havenford is surrounded by a most beautiful and picturesque field of lava, which at first swells to a gentle eminence, then sinks again, and finally stretches, in one wide plain, to the neighbouring hills. The different masses, black and bare, arise, in the most varied shapes, to the height of ten or fifteen feet, and assume the figures of walls, pillars, grottoes, and

excavations, over which large level pieces will often make a natural bridge; the whole formed by blocks of congealed lava, which in some places are covered to their summit with grass and moss, presenting that delusive appearance of stunted trees which I saw from the ship. The horses, sheep, and cows, scramble about in these fields, industriously seeking out every green spot; and I myself was never weary of scrambling. I could not sufficiently admire and wonder at this fearfully beautiful picture of desolation. * * * The view is bounded on one side by several ranges of high mountains, among which the jokals (glaciers) were conspicuous, still covered far down their sides with the winter's snows; and on the other it is open to the sea. At a little distance, I was impressed with the belief that many of the valleys and hillocks were covered with verdure, and I thought I saw several beautiful meadows; but, upon a closer investigation, I ascertained that they were marshes, containing hundreds and hundreds of little eminences, not unlike molehills, or small grave-mounds, overgrown with grass and moss. From one spot I could overlook a wide circuit of eight or ten (German) miles (equivalent to thirty-six to forty-five English miles) without being able to perceive a single tree, or bush, or field, or village. All was lifeless. We passed a few scattered cottages, but we rarely heard the chirp of a bird, and still more rarely a friendly salutation from a human voice. We were completely surrounded with streams of lava, or bogs and swamps; not a spot was to be seen in that whole space which could have been turned up by the plough.—*Ibid.* p. 67.

This scene equally strikes all travellers; nor does science seem able to account for the strange forms of these lava-fields, awful in their fantastic shapeless masses.

Madame Pfeiffer made Reikjavick her head-quarters, from whence she made various excursions after her own hardy independent fashion: indeed, the roads do not allow of much luxury of conveyance. There is not a carriage of any description, not even a wheelbarrow in the island, nor anywhere a road which could be traversed by them. Horses are universal: everybody rides; and these hardy, sure-footed creatures, which do their masters such good service, actually live out of doors all the winter; needing little more from man through this long and severe season than his assistance in removing the snow from the moss on which they chiefly subsist. They will not eat hay, but contrive just to keep themselves alive through the cold on this poor wintry fare, assisted by such offal from the fish as even an Iceland kitchen finds no use for, and when the grass grows once more, get up their strength and looks in a wonderfully short time, and are ready for work. One of her first excursions to the sulphur-springs, on which she set out on the 4th of June, brings her across a vast lava-stream:—

* About a mile beyond Havenfiord, I saw, for the first time, some birches, which were not more than two feet, or two feet and a half high, however. I also remarked some whortleberry-bushes; and a number of little butterflies, all the same size, and apparently of the same species, were fluttering around the plants and shrubs. The manifold shapes and figures into which the lava was thrown, constantly struck me with renewed astonishment;

guished by its superior size and louder subterranean rumblings; at the top of which is the basin of the fountain, some four feet deep, and with a diameter of about fifty feet, and in its centre, forming a gigantic tunnel, a pipe or tube descends, up which the boiling water rises, and the eruptions burst forth. (See Barrow's *Iceland*, p. 177.) This tube, or caldron, together with the basin, in the intervals of the explosions are filled with boiling water, as clear as crystal. The explosions are capricious in their performances, and have to be waited for, giving the traveller leisure to make what scientific observations he is capable of in the period of anxious expectation. Madame Pfeiffer began her watch at night, not without some of the apprehensions natural to her sex, as well as peculiar to the situation:—

‘The tent was put in order for me by eleven o’clock, when all took their leave, and I was left alone. For fear of missing an explosion, it is customary to watch during the whole night. An occasional vigil would present no great difficulty to many travellers; but for me it was a serious undertaking. However, there was no remedy; for an Iceland peasant is not to be depended upon, and few of them would be roused by an outbreak of Hecla itself.

‘I sat beneath my tent, or in front of it, listening with stretched attention for the signs I had been told to expect. Towards midnight—the hour of spirits—I heard a few dull sounds, like those of a distant cannon, and rushing from my tent, I waited for the subterranean rumblings and the tremblings and splitting of the earth, which, according to the books I had read, were the forerunners of an eruption. I could hardly defend myself from a paroxysm of fear: it is no slight thing to be alone at midnight in such a scene. * * The low rumblings were repeated thirteen times at very short intervals, the basin overflowed after each noise, and nearly emptied itself of its waters, the sound appearing to proceed from their violent ebullition rather than from any subterranean commotion. In a minute and a half the shock was over. The waters no longer overflowed the basin and caldron, which remained nearly full; and, disappointed in every respect, I returned to my tent.’—*Ibid.* p. 173.

Nothing further occurred during the next day and following night, during which she occupied her leisure in investigating the various wonders of the scene—the Strokker, a boiling fountain, leaping and bubbling with extraordinary violence, sharing the fame of the Geiser, but not reaching to the same height, and two springs close together, to her mind among the most beautiful in the world, from their wonderful clearness, and a sort of supernatural play of colours in them, independent of the sunshine.

‘At last, after waiting till the second day of my sojourn at the Geiser, the long-desired explosion took place, on the 27th of June, at half-past nine in the evening. * * I have really no words to do justice to this magnificent spectacle, which once to behold in a lifetime is enough. It infinitely surpassed all my expectations. The waters were spouted with great power and volume; column rising above column, as if each were bent on outstripping the others. After I had recovered in some degree from my first

relinquished his design; Madame Pfeiffer accomplished hers, and, all things considered, makes very little fuss about the fatigue and danger of doing so. We are far from saying that Mr. Barrow's was not the wiser decision; but this must not deprive the enterprising German lady of her due credit.

'After all,' (says Mr. Barrow,) 'there is no great wisdom, perhaps, in courting both toil and danger, by climbing up a mountain buried in snow, where nothing is to be seen. The people in the neighbourhood, it seems, discourage every one from attempting it. When the French doctor made the attempt, he was told that it was the entrance into the infernal regions, and that the devil was busily employed in handing down the souls of all those who fall in battle. Sir Joseph Banks was told that the mountain was guarded by a number of strange black birds, resembling crows; and with beaks of iron, they would receive in a very ungracious manner any one who might presume to infringe upon their territory. Sir Joseph found the mountain surrounded, as the Frenchman says, for two leagues, with scoræ, pumice-stone, cinders, and ashes. On reaching the summit, which was calculated from the state of the barometer to be five thousand feet, the cold was extremely severe, and the party had their clothes covered with ice in such a manner, that, to use his own expression, "clothes resembled buckram." As there was nothing to see, there was no object to induce them to prolong their stay. Sir George Mackenzie climbed up amidst fog and ashes; got to the top, where he found a small crater filled with snow; looked round when the sky cleared up a little, and then came down again. All things considered, therefore, I may perhaps console myself for my disappointment with the reflection, that I have lost but little pleasure, and escaped much fatigue; but still it would have been something to say, "I have been to the summit of Hecla."—*Barrow*, p. 197.

Madame Pfeiffer's difficulties came in a more characteristic form. She was assailed, not through her imagination, but her purse—the claims of which she always regards; knowing it in fact to be the only substitute in these times for the seven-leagued boots and other conveniences with which our childhood was familiar. The guide who was to lead her through, and himself to share all these disagreeables and dangers, asked her the 'outrageous sum of five dollars, and two marks,' which, put into English, is just eleven shillings and sixpence, for this formidable day's work for himself and his horse. 'What could I do?' asks this most thrifty of wonder seekers; 'there was no other guide to be had, and he knew it well, so I was obliged to accede to his terms.' So having passed the night in what she calls a loathsome hole, sleeping on a chest shorter than herself, and close to a half-putrid fish drying in the smoke—for such are the comforts of an Iceland hut, enhanced in this case by finding herself an object of curiosity to all the inhabitants of the hamlet, who crowded in through the open door to superintend her repose—she was ready betimes to begin her journey:—

'It was a beautiful warm morning, and we galloped gaily over the meadows and the adjacent sand plains. This fine weather was considered a very favourable omen by my guide, who told me that M. Geimard, the French naturalist already mentioned, had been delayed three days by a

describe. I despair of conveying to my reader a distinct idea of the immense waste which lay displayed before me, with its accumulated masses of lava and its peculiar appearance of lifeless desolation. I seemed to stand in the midst of an exhausted fire. The blocks were piled in heaps above each other, till they formed high hills; the valleys were choked by vast streams of rock, whose height and breadth I was not able to distinguish, although the course of the last eruption could plainly be distinguished among them.

'I was surrounded by the most dreadful ravines, caves, streams, hills and valleys; I could hardly understand how I had reached this point, and was seized with a feeling of horror at the thought which forced itself upon me, that perhaps I might never be able to find my way out of this terrible labyrinth of ruin.

'There, on the highest peak of Hecla, I could look down far and wide upon the uninhabited land, the image of a torpid nature, passionless, inanimate—and yet sublime; an image which once seen can never be forgotten, and the remembrance of which will prove an ample compensation for all the toils and difficulties I had endured. A whole world of glaciers, mountains of lava, fields of snow and ice, rivers and miniature lakes, were included in that magnificent prospect; and the foot of man had never ventured within those regions of gloom and solitude. * * * I thank my God that He has allowed me to see this chaos of His creation.'—*Ibid.* p. 200.

Our authoress in this case has succeeded in conveying a picture—an awful scene is well described. Hecla, when she saw it, had had no eruption for eighty years, and was regarded as an exhausted volcano; five months after, it broke out with greater fury than ever.

What space remains to us we must now bestow on the observations Madame Pfeiffer was able to make, on the habits and manners of the people, during her stay in the island, which extended from the middle of May to the end of July. We have said that she considers the reports on these points, hitherto given by travellers, to be romantic and too favourably coloured. Some of their chief faults, which might pass unnoticed or only guessed at by wealthier travellers, who carry their own conveniences with them, and provide themselves with tents for their accommodation at night, she was in a condition to see and judge of, living more amongst them than others would venture to do. She can thus pronounce very decidedly on the extreme, enormous dirt of the lower orders in Iceland, and again on their indolent, unpunctual, and as she thinks, selfish habits. Whatever stood in the way of her own plans would be likely to be severely viewed; but on both points Mr. Barrow also speaks. While he can only hope and charitably suppose that the interior of an Iceland hut may be better and a less intolerable lodging than the outside promises, Madame Pfeiffer from personal experience can pronounce the worst anticipations to be far more than realized.

'Icelandic huts are small and low, built of lava blocks filled in with earth, the whole sodded over with grass, and they might easily be mistaken

clothing; and are generally appropriated as night quarters for the traveller. I doubt if so great a desecration of a sacred building would be permitted even among the most uncivilized nations. It is true that I was assured the practice was about to be forbidden; but it ought never to have been allowed, and I am by no means certain it will be discontinued in future, for wherever I went, the church was always at my service at night, and I was sure to find it half full of fish, tallow, and every other ill-savoured thing.

The church at Krisuvick is twenty feet long and ten feet wide, and it was very far from being in a condition to accommodate me on my arrival; but saddles, stockings, dresses, hats, and implements of every description were hastily thrown into a corner; blankets were produced, with two or three beautiful soft pillows, and my bed was made on the chest which contained the priestly garments and altar cloths. When this was done, I would gladly have shut myself in to prepare my evening meal, and write a few lines in my journal before I lay down to rest; but such a thing was not to be thought of; all the inhabitants came in a body to look at me, and I was soon surrounded by young and old, who streamed into the church, and hemmed me in on all sides. Unpleasant as was their staring, I was obliged to submit to it, for it would have been impossible to drive away the crowd without giving great offence; I therefore unpacked my little valise, and prepared to boil my coffee in public. Upon this, my spectators all put their heads together, and seemed lost in astonishment when I lighted the spirits of wine, following every movement with their eyes. My frugal supper ended, I found their perseverance had not flagged in the least; being determined to put it to the proof, I took out my journal and began to write. For a few moments they watched me in silence, when they all suddenly exclaimed: "She is writing, she is writing!" but they still made no sign towards leaving me, and remained perfectly motionless, every eye fixed upon me for a full hour; yes, I believe I might have been sitting there still without having been able to write them out of my presence, if it had not been too much to endure; at last I managed to dismiss my audience by giving them to understand that I wished to go to sleep.—*Ibid.* p. 123.

Madame Pfeiffer gives us to understand that it is by no means pleasant spending the night alone in a church surrounded by a burying ground, and has more nervous feelings on the occasion than we should have given her credit for; however, it was only for the first time, and then probably because the cold and a storm of wind kept her awake. On another occasion, a clergyman whom she describes as a very well-informed, well-read man, entertained her, together with his wife and children, with a comfortable meal in the church, which was previously adorned with the clothing of himself and his family suspended from the altar-rails. Mr. Barrow gives a curious description of the Church of Thingvalla, where he and his party slept on their journey. To judge by his accompanying sketch, it must rank amongst the humblest Christian temples in the world, though he describes others in still more discreditable disorder. In approaching the village they had not been able to discover a human habitation, till some grass-covered elevations proved to be the dwellings of the inhabitants, one of which, larger than

the rest, was the church; there they asked leave to pass the night. It was full of stores, barrels of fish and the like; so that with their own travelling equipage, the aisle was nearly impassable. Its proportions were much the same as those of the church at Krisuvick; the altar consisted of a 'wooden chest or cupboard,' over which was a 'miserable' painting of the Lord's Supper; two small panes of glass let in light at the east end, and on the beams of the roof rested old Bibles, Psalters and MS. in dust and confusion. The party found their rest on the floor between the altar and the wall. The clergyman who allowed this was 'unremitting in his attentions,' and very civil and friendly, and so far a scholar, that he could converse in Latin with Mr. Barrow.

The religion of the island we need not say is Lutheran, with some departures, Madame Pfeiffer says, from the order of the service of that communion in her own country. The churches seem well attended considering the scattered nature of the parishes. Nor do we hear of any differences or divisions amongst them; the 300 clergy and their bishop are agreed, and their flocks, as far as we can gather, submit to their rule. But this unanimity loses much of its force and value when we contemplate the mode of life of the clergy, the necessary secularity of their pursuits, and the relation in which they stand to the people, 'labouring among them,' not so much in the ecclesiastical sense, as literally with their own hands for their maintenance. There is something, it cannot be denied, sordid in the existence described; their poverty has nothing poetical in it, nor perhaps can it have in a country so little blessed by nature. Clerical benefices in Iceland do not average above 10*l.* a-year, some of them are stated to be only 4*l.* The clergyman, to exist at all, has to spend his time as the peasants do, to toil in his scanty glebe in a labourer's dress, to add to his gains by the most incongruous employment—for the clergy are the acknowledged blacksmiths of the island, and each parsonage is furnished with a smithy;—to live in houses which hardly admit of comfort or cleanliness, and on fare which seems to unite every term of disparagement; meagre, unnutritious, sour, coarse, rancid. Such evils, acquiesced in rather than struggled against, speak for themselves, against the accounts of high mental cultivation with which readers were once amused. Jeremy Taylor says truly, that the student cannot live on the 'sossets and gobbets' of the peasant. Refinement in habits of living is necessary for the development of the intellect. Some reading no doubt there is in Iceland, and some learning, but its amount is only surprising from its existing in scenes where in our own country we should look only for brute ignorance—it would not be counted as *learning* in more civilized communities. And the

instances which are brought forward of high mental cultivation in juxtaposition with this sordid existence, only prove what we say. Much is made, for instance, of the fact, that the island possesses a printing press, and one '*triumph*' which is quoted, (and we do not dispute the term,) of intellect over pinching poverty, is the case of Jonas Thorlakson, a parish priest, who translated 'Pope's Essay on Man,' and the '*Paradise Lost*,' into Icelandic verse, for which our own Literary Fund, hearing of his poverty, and anxious to show its sense of his labours, raised a small subscription sufficient to secure the affluence of his last days.

The peasants of Iceland too have a character for learning, and with some reason, for all can read, and it is said that a clergyman can refuse the rite of marriage to those who cannot. In their long winters, reading is said to be one of their amusements, and some of the peasants are so far scholars as to understand a little Latin, and books may often be seen in their wretched huts. But these acquirements promote neither ingenuity nor enterprise, nor any desire for comfort or cleanliness. They are remarked on as peculiarly without invention, and content with, or rather as doggedly attached to, the most awkward and inconvenient customs and contrivances. Both our travellers complain, for instance, of their mode of loading their horses. They seem to have no means really of keeping things on the animal's back. The whole burden is perpetually slipping off, and precious time is being lost all day long in lifting it on again, till the next loss of balance brings all down again. Our methodical alert adventuress is sensibly alive to these provocations. She points out swamps that they ought to drain, fields they ought to cultivate, and improvements of all sorts—such, for instance, as the use of chairs and tables, which are yet unknown luxuries in a peasant's hut,—which a little industry could effect; and 'having considered the Icelanders as the 'laziest people in existence, from the first moment of her arrival 'in the country,' she gives a little anecdote connected with one of the principal roads in the island to confirm her view.

'The moor where we stopped to rest was separated from the lava fields by a ditch, over which a bridge was formed by a few stones heaped together, but so carelessly that the horses could hardly advance without stepping into some of the holes, and they resisted so long before they could be made to venture across, that we were obliged to alight and lead them over.

'We had just passed this place, and established ourselves in the meadow, when a caravan of fifteen horses loaded with boards and dried fish came along. These animals remarked the danger of the bridge, and could only be driven over it by repeated blows of the whip. There was abundance of stone not twenty paces from the spot, but sooner than turn out of their way even for that short distance, these indolent creatures would rather cudgel

their horses, and let them run the risk of breaking their legs. I felt so much compassion for the poor animals who would have to cross the bridge in future, that as soon as the other party was out of sight, I devoted part of my hours of repose to collecting some large stones, with which I filled up the holes, a labour which was easily accomplished in fifteen minutes.'—*Ibid.* p. 138.

However, the mention of these horses reminds us of one ingenious expedient, which must we think be native to Iceland, and which ought in justice to be recorded. Mr. Barrow tells us :

'The Icelanders have a most curious custom and a most effectual one of preventing horses from straying, which I believe is peculiar to this island. Two gentlemen, for instance, are riding together without attendants, and wishing to alight for the purpose of visiting some object at a distance from the road, they tie the head of one horse to the tail of another, and the head of this to the tail of the former. In this state it is utterly impossible they can move on either backwards or forwards, one pulling one way and the other the other; and therefore, if disposed to move at all, it will only be in a circle, and even then there must be an agreement to turn their heads the same way.'—*Barrow's Iceland*, p. 252.

Is it a fabulous amplification of this practice, which we have been told of elsewhere, or a legitimate development of it,—that the congregation of an Iceland church secure their horses by tying them head to tail in a large ring round the building, about which they trot in an endless circle till the returning worshippers release them?

But though Madame Pfeiffer declaims against their indolence and unpunctuality, anathematizes their dirt, depreciates their learning, suffers from their rude curiosity, and shows up their love of money—'no money, no Iclander,'—she yet does allow them some genuine sterling good qualities. They are all well and comfortably clad, there are no beggars among them, and she pronounces them absolutely trustworthy; she could leave her things lying about for hours, and never missed the least thing. It would, she says, be perfectly safe to sleep there without bolts and bars, and crimes are of such rare occurrence, that as we have said, the prison has been put to other uses. This immunity, we are sorry to see from Mr. Barrow's statistics, does not however extend to sins against what is most commonly understood by *morality*, and while he commends their sobriety, Madame Pfeiffer speaks of drunkenness as the national vice; but this difference may be accounted for by brandy having been of late years very much cheaper, as well as by her own want of experience in the habits of northern nations, where ardent spirits are always drunk in a much larger proportion than in the south.

It is not fair to our authoress to conclude without some mention of the extraordinary hardships through which she worked her way to an acquaintance with this wild and cheerless,

though beautiful country; so cheerless indeed to all but its own children, that we owe some apology to these, for having dwelt upon their alleged national failings at all, when we consider how few of what we regard as the pleasures and blessings of life they possess, and how contented is their existence in scenes and a climate full, to more fortunate men, of intolerable privations. Madame Pfeiffer did not indeed prove what an Iceland *winter* is, but its best season is a bad one to live in, especially exposed as she was to all its vicissitudes by day and night, if we can apply, as she says, that term to their short summer twilight. After describing a halt, necessary from the exhausted state of the horses, in an open field in a pouring rain, where she had no alternative but to walk, weary as she was, or sit down on the wet ground, she says:—

‘I think I may flatter myself that I was born to be a traveller; I never take cold from any degree of exposure; in this whole tour I had not a single warm meal, nor any substantial food. I slept every night on chests or benches, rode fifty-five miles (about 247 English miles) in six days, besides scrambling about in the Grotto of Surthellix; and in spite of all these privations and hardships I returned to Reikjavick in perfect health and spirits.’—*Voyage to Iceland*, p. 165.

In giving advice to travellers in general, she speaks of what economy obliged her to endure, especially the necessity of riding ‘incredible’ distances to obtain any shelter for the night. Also her distaste for Iceland cookery, and the disregard of cleanliness with which it was managed,—for she is not in this volume quite as independent of such considerations as experience afterwards made her,—confined her sometimes for ten days at a time to bread and cheese. The dangers of the way were often really alarming; where, for example, the path led over fields of snow far from any human habitation, ready to crack under the horses’ feet and to precipitate the rider into inextricable depths; or where swollen rivers had to be forded, and the horses, in terror at the torrent around them, could scarcely be brought to obey the rein. Our readers, however, are acquainted with Madame Pfeiffer’s spirit; we have only to show them that Iceland afforded a good education for her, more varied adventures. And every danger passed, with her, was in truth and in more senses than one, a danger over, as she explains in re-fording the torrent which had the first time really alarmed her.

‘When I rode up the Rangaa, I crossed it a second time without the least alarm, although I had no longer a protector [a kind village priest who had guided her before] by my side. Such is our nature; dangers once passed have no longer the power to terrify us; we meet them with scarcely a thought, and are only surprised to remember how much uneasiness we may have suffered at first.’—*Ibid.* p. 204.

This is doubtless a true saying as well as a good rule, but it needs a brave spirit to adventure upon known dangers a second and a third time, till custom has power to exercise its sure control over the mind. In saying our farewell to this singular woman, we must wish her good success in her present undertaking, one in which she is engaged while we write, and which we should describe as more formidable as well as more useful than any previous journey, but that it is feared that want of means will prevent her carrying out her full design, which is no other than to penetrate into the interior of Africa, and bring to light some of the secrets of that hidden and mysterious land; trusting that a constitution that had borne the cold of Iceland and the heat of Babylonia unimpaired, might even endure the more subtle dangers which there await the European. But no sooner does she touch Capetown than she is tormented by her monster evil, high charges. Not even in London or Canton does money fly so fast, and she stands in great danger, with her goal in view, and encouraged by all who know the habits of the natives to trust in her sex and adventure among them, to be turned back for the want of a very few hundred pounds. One person in the world has the inclination and all requisites for an important and hazardous work, but the money; amongst the hundreds of thousands who fail in all she possesses, and possess the one thing that she lacks, surely some one will be found to come forward and help her.

ART. II.—1. *The Poetical Works of David Macbeth Moir* (Δ).
Edited by THOMAS AIRD; *with a Memoir of the Author.*
 Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London.

2. *The Poetical Works of John Edmund Reade.* London: Chapman & Hall.

It is but a trite remark, that, as no two individuals are precisely the same externally in features and countenance, so likewise are there none altogether presenting the same cast and character of mind and thought. It is true also, that, as in respect of outward appearance it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between those who strongly resemble each other, so oftentimes it requires a subtle discrimination to discern the peculiarities of intellect in men whose minds seem to have been cast in the same mould. The majority of men, indeed, have so little which stands forth as preeminently characteristic; being formed as though after a general type, admitting manifold slight differences, which yet are in great measure merged in a general likeness. But even amongst men who are not to be classed with those who exhibit only this ordinary type of intellectual character, and in whom exist peculiarities both moral and mental, constituting a clear individuality, we do from time to time meet with examples of intellectual development which appear to belong to one or more in common,—wherein the dwelling on the cast of mind which one displays, instantly brings before us the picture of another. So much do the minds of some men appear but an echo of each other. But if the strong mental resemblances, which we frequently find in different individuals, are such as to make the task of discriminating between them no very easy matter, the utterly opposing and conflicting methods by which different minds may work out the same subject,—nay, even arrive, perhaps, at the same conclusion,—are even more remarkable and astonishing.

To analyse and classify the various forms of mental character which are found in men whose intellectual faculties have not been dulled by a protracted slumber, but have acquired vigour from constant exercise, is a work beyond our province;—but amidst all these indefinite varieties two especial types seem prominently to stand forth, which, although by no means serving for an exhaustive division, appear practically to distinguish men, who have not suffered their minds to remain inert, in ordinary life and conversation. These two classes seem to have

Such a mode of looking at things may perhaps be amenable to the charge of a monotonous and wearisome sameness, which is for ever treading in the same track, and ever loth to diverge either to the right hand or the left. The reply perhaps of most weight to this objection might be, that minds of this metaphysical character and generalizing tendency are adapted for the accomplishment of a work which can never be effected by those of the opposite stamp. Yet this also becomes matter of doubt upon consideration that, although men whose cast of mind seems ever to lead them into abstract thought rarely if ever speak the language which is used by men of different intellectual character, yet the latter are frequently well able and ready to handle questions of an abstract nature, or prepare themselves to master an abstract science; whence it would follow that their range of mind is, after all, a wider one. Whether such as these are calculated to reach the greatest heights of abstract research, and add to the amount of knowledge already gained, is another question; but it may well be doubted whether they, whose names in this province are most eminent, did, on whatsoever subject, ordinary or otherwise, exhibit the same tendency to generalize, and ever employed the same strained and monotonous language; and it might perhaps be a subject worthy of examination, whether the presence of the highest capabilities for abstract science may be consistent with the greatest power of looking upon and treating objects as existing in, so to speak, their concrete and embodied state. Howsoever this may be, there are certainly very many, who, without winning for themselves the highest celebrity in that province of knowledge the peculiar language of which they ordinarily employ, appear still for the most part incapable of clothing their thoughts in the expressions made use of by men whose minds are content to dwell in less remote and exalted regions, and exhibit in themselves the very opposite to the tendency for personification manifested by the Greek, a proneness to merge distinct individual form in the contemplation of general and pervading qualities.

Nor is the whole topic one which may be cursorily noticed and lightly laid aside, for it involves considerations of some moment in the giving judgment, in the way of either praise or blame, for the particular treatment of any given subject. The last-named class of minds is by no means scanty in numbers; it seems to exist in stronger force in other countries; but many belonging to it are to be found here also; and it becomes necessary to realize, so far as in us lies, the condition of intellectual power and its exercise as manifested by them. For in addition to the monotonousness which after awhile becomes

apparent in this method of thinking and speaking, there arise constant charges of obscurity,—of thoughts in themselves involved and intricate being put forth in language which is scarcely intelligible,—of studied mistiness and cloudiness of expression,—advancing finally to the assertion, that behind this dark veil there may after all be nothing to be revealed. Undoubtedly, obscurity, intricacy, confusedness, and such like words, are in a measure relative terms; nothing can be understood without that effort of mind which may be necessary to master it; and they who have not so striven have no right to bring a charge of obscurity against one for whose mind the subject, from long acquaintance, possesses no obscurity at all. And with this must be taken into account the force of long continued habit; the mind, associated from early years, it may be, with the custom of stripping subjects of thought of their peculiarities, in order to discern wherein they agree, and of rising from the contemplation of the individual to the properties of the class or genus to which it belongs, has come to give a meaning of its own to particular forms of expression, which therefore to itself fully serve to convey an idea, while at the same time they may seem to others little better than a mere assemblage of words. And even short of this, many a passage which appears strained, obscure, and affected, may have been purposed to express a fixed and definite meaning in the writer's mind;—and might also bear precisely the same and no other meaning in the eyes of another whose mind was of the same mould. This brings us back to a former assertion, that this class employs a language of its own, which may for itself be an adequate vehicle for the expression of its thoughts;—it only remains a question whether, all this being granted, the charge of obscure thought and strained language may not still be pressed against it. We shall be obliged to recur to this subject hereafter; for the present, it may suffice to say that altogether this cast of mind is apparently one which has sprung into existence in these later ages of the world, and that certainly the language employed by it is but the growth of a limited number of years; not indeed that the language of abstract science is of recent origin, but the novelty lies in the ever recurring use of abstract ideas, when speaking even of the most ordinary matters of feeling or intellectual apprehension.

We have lingered, perhaps, too long before entering on our subject, but the foregoing thoughts have been immediately suggested on a comparison of the writings of the two authors whose names are prefixed to this article. Whether the former of the two were capable, if the subject were brought before him, of throwing himself into the regions of the abstract,

(we must almost ask indulgence ourselves for employing such words so often,) or whether his mind, from a more limited range, sought to derive its lessons from the open page of nature, art, or history, apart from the general laws which govern them, clear enough, nevertheless, it seems to be that the mind of the latter author delights in constant generalizations, and that he appears to breathe more freely in the regions of the exalted and the inane, to which others might be disposed to resort at less frequent intervals. While the former writer dwells with a minute and loving carefulness on each component part, for example, of a beautiful landscape, or examines with a searching and delighted eye the leaves and petals of an opening flower, or takes in with greedy ear the mingled sounds of animal life, which seem to speak of existence itself as a delight on a summer's day,—with the latter, it very rarely indeed happens but that, after a short mention of a fact, or slight sketch of a scene, he roams away into general reflections on the original cause or present condition of things, many of which, without much difficulty, might be transferred to other subjects as well as to the one in hand. A more complete contrast in character of mind and language between two writers could scarcely be met with, accompanied as it is with a moral disposition, certainly in more than one point closely corresponding,—a kind of common ground-work, on which have been reared fabrics of strangely different outline and proportion.

As regards this collective edition of their works, the two writers, in one respect, come before the public in different relations: the latter still contemplates further labours, and entertains the hope of sending the results of them forth into the world; Mr. Moir has but recently been taken from the scene of his earthly toil; and while of Mr. Reade we have no further knowledge than what is furnished in the Poems themselves, our judgment of Mr. Moir's poetry must in due measure be influenced by the information which the prefixed Memoir gives us. Of Mr. Reade, in reference more especially to his own sentiments and principles of belief, we must speak, while with all respect, yet with all freedom; for the other, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*; and, happily, this is an injunction which, in the present case, we have little or no temptation to infringe. While speaking thus, it must not be concluded that the whole system of belief and practice in which Mr. Moir was trained, and in which he lived, is one with which we can profess much sympathy. The member of a body which, regarded in its religious aspect, stands forth to those who are external to it in a light as cold, repulsive, and forbidding as almost any self-chosen religious system can do, and which, regarded intellectually, has from time to time shown its dislike

to mental activity, except when exercised in certain approved and authorized directions, we cannot but regard Mr. Moir in his poetic capacity as by no means the genuine growth of the system in which he was involved. Harsh and uninviting in itself as was the scheme of belief set before him, he had from other quarters to borrow warmer hues, and clothe it in more attractive colours. But the man himself comes before us as one who in no ordinary degree did through life his duty in that state to which God had called him, whose eye was ever carried forward into the future, living, as he appears to have done, with a constant and abiding presence of responsibility, with a sense ever of man's weakness, to be overcome and strengthened only by Divine aid; and therefore we owe to great regard for his character as presented to us in these volumes. All this, indeed, we might have almost wholly gathered from the Poems themselves; the Memoir, apart from the individual portraiture, is chiefly valuable as throwing light on his mode of composition, and the reasons of the particular forms in which his works are cast, accounting also for the absence of any lengthened and more elaborate poems, as also for the frequent recurrence of similar ideas and passages throughout.

The outlines of Mr. Moir's life may be comprised in the compass of a few words; he was born at Musselburgh, and there his whole life was passed, being educated to the medical profession, in the constant and laborious practice of which his time was continually occupied. The wishes expressed by many of his friends that he should remove to Edinburgh had with him no influence; he was useful to many, and valued where he was: and the prospect of additional reputation was not incitement enough to induce him to leave them. Prosecuting with an untiring energy his medical avocations, the main part of his day he necessarily passed in active exercise, and moving from place to place; and his undeviating rule being, 'business first, and pleasure afterwards,' it is plain how little uninterrupted time he had at his disposal for reading. Late at night, or in his carriage, or for a short time before commencing his daily rounds, he gave what time he could command to pursuits which were foreign to his profession as a physician. And even amongst the products of these leisure moments not the least considerable was itself a medical work, which greatly increased his reputation amongst his colleagues. The bar is known to be very jealous of the devotion of its members to general literature; medicine places its votaries somewhat on a similar footing: but against Mr. Moir no charge of insufficient attention to his immediate work could be brought; what he did, whether in prose or poetry, was accomplished in intervals which most men would have in great

measure devoted to mere bodily recreation or idleness. Almost all the poems contained in these volumes are contributions, during a space of upwards of thirty years, to 'Blackwood's Magazine;' most of them being short pieces, and only two or three exceeding some one or two hundred lines in length. It is but fair, therefore, to allow at once that Mr. Moir's poetry must not be weighed in the same balance with the collective works of a poet sent forth by himself in his own life-time. Contributing week after week, and month after month, to the columns of a Magazine, it is difficult, without personal experience of the same thing, to realize how great the temptation to a writer must be, (oftentimes unconsciously influencing him,) to rest contented with a trite thought, or a hackneyed illustration, or sameness of imagery. The contribution of each succeeding number is read, admired, and put aside; it passes away from the reader's memory, it fades away more or less from the writer's also; and after the lapse of some months, or a year or two at most, a poem, very similar in point of thought and expression, may be written by the poet as if it were something entirely new, and received as such by the readers. The mind seems to acquire a habit of manufacturing verses,—there grows up a kind of machinery and apparatus of thought, through which the consecutive subjects must pass; and the chances are numerous enough that one way or another the ready-made and long-accustomed thoughts and illustrations will be found to suit. And all this may be taking place with scarcely any or with no consciousness on the part of the author. It is a danger to which he is necessarily exposed from not having the body of his past writings continually before his eyes; he loses the chance of detecting many a repetition; and manifestly each successive repetition induces a monotony of thought, reducing the writer less or more to the condition of a man (and some such there are) who has finished thinking at a certain time, and for the remainder of his days draws on his already accumulated stock without ever troubling himself to add to it.

It seems difficult in any other way to account for the very frequent recurrence of certain images, illustrations, and even whole courses of thought, in the poetry of a man who, beyond doubt, is deserving of the name of a poet, and some of which we thankfully receive as a contribution worthy to be laid up with the κτήματα ἐς αἰὲς of which we may already boast: some of it is, as certainly, common-place and ephemeral enough; but yet this must not be suffered to interfere with our estimation of what is really valuable. We have heard of recent critics who, so far from allowing that even Homer himself at times may slumber, seem to go far towards cutting off even those whose

from us, and embalming them in an undecaying memory, is certainly the most pleasing and perhaps the most prominent characteristic of Mr. Moir's poetry. The language of real feeling is sure to be impressive; even men of the class which we have before described, the most fond of abstract inquiry and metaphysical discussions, speak, almost involuntarily, a different language when they really come to feel or endeavour to realize the condition of mind of a person in real sorrow and anguish. Apart from this, Wordsworth's proposition, that the language of poetry and prose are identical, becomes an untrue one; but with this, be it poetry or be it prose, we feel as if brought into a universal school, the lessons of which all can learn, and the language of which every one can understand. Possibly in such topics there may be room for not much of originality; but in this sense we may reverently say it, there is nothing new under the sun; and we must still have our sympathies awake for fresh examples of the truth that man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards. But in proportion as the sorrow assumes a deeper character, when the grief is that of the husband, the father, or the brother, and therefore in proportion as our own feelings are more warmly affected, in the same proportion the powers of criticism are disarmed; we shrink from minutely examining the words which flow from a broken heart, or enshrine the memory of the loved, the blank of whose absence can never be filled up; we acknowledge the presence as of some sacred power, and we would not irreverently break in upon the stillness and the mournful calm of sorrow. Were Mr. Moir's domestic pieces other than they are, so long as they retained their present pathos, we should not desire to speak harshly of them: as it is, they exhibit all the smoothness and elegance of diction which the best pieces throughout the poems possess. But without further comment, we will cite some portions of a poem entitled '*Casa Wappy*' (the self-appellative of a beloved child):—

' And hast thou sought thy heavenly home,
Our fond, dear boy,
The realms where sorrow dare not come,
Where life is joy?
Pure at thy death, as at thy birth,
Thy spirit caught no taint from earth:
Even by its bliss we mete our dearth,
Casa Wappy.

' Thou wert a vision of delight,
To bless us given:
Beauty embodied to our sight,
A type of heaven.

* * * * *

' Farewell, then—for awhile farewell—
 Pride of my heart;
 It cannot be that long we dwell
 Thus torn apart.
 Time's shadows like the shuttle flee,
 And, dark howe'er life's night may be,
 Beyond the grave, I'll meet with thee,
 Casa Wappy.'—Vol. i. pp. 16—21.

One more quotation from the domestic pieces, and then we must hasten on to other topics. The following is an extract from lines on the death of another son:—

' Fare thee well, our last and fairest,
 Dear wee Willie, fare thee well;
 God, who lent thee, hath recall'd thee
 Back with Him and His to dwell:
 Fifteen moons their silver lustre
 Only o'er thy brow had shed,
 When thy spirit join'd the seraphs,
 And thy dust the dead.

' Like a sunbeam, through our dwelling
 Shone thy presence bright and calm:
 Thou didst add a zest to pleasure,
 To our sorrows thou wert balm;
 Brighter beam'd thine eyes than summer;
 And thy first attempts at speech
 Thrill'd our heart-strings with a rapture
 Music ne'er could reach.

' As we gazed upon thee sleeping,
 With thy fine fair locks outspread,
 Thou didst seem a little angel,
 Who to earth from Heaven had stray'd;
 And entranced, we watch'd the vision,
 Half in hope and half affright,
 Lest what we deem'd ours, and earthly,
 Should dissolve in light.

* * * * *

' Five were ye, the beauteous blossoms
 Of our hopes, our hearts, our hearth;
 Two asleep lie buried under,
 Three for us yet gladden earth.
 Thee, our hyacinth, gay Charlie,
 Willie, thee our snowdrop pure,—
 Back to us shall second spring-time
 Never more allure.

' Yet while thinking, oh! our lost ones,
 Of how dear ye were to us,
 Why should dreams of doubt and darkness
 Haunt our troubled spirits thus?
 Why across the cold dim churchyard
 Flit our visions of despair?
 Seated on the tomb Faith's Angel
 Says "Ye are not there."

Again, he traces up their track—

‘To where immortal spirits reign,’

and pictures the

‘Blessed sight
Unto the angels only given,
Where thy two brothers, robed in light,
Embraced thee at the gates of Heaven.’—Vol. i. p. 35.

And again:—

‘A halo glows around thy brow,
The Seraphs are thy playmates now.’—Vol. i. p. 43.

And amidst many like passages we have a picture of Heaven:

‘Where by the murmur of silver springs
The Cherubim fold their snow-white wings;
Where those who were sever’d re-meet in joy,
Which death can never more destroy.’—Vol. i. p. 147.

In another poem he thus speaks:—

‘Though angel now, thou yet mayst deign
To bend thy radiant look on me.’—Vol. ii. p. 338.

But it is not enough thus to advance them at once to the condition which shall be theirs when the last enemy shall have been destroyed, and the kingdom delivered up to the Father; they are themselves made the ministering angels,—a view very clearly brought out in a piece entitled an ‘Address to Little Children,’ wherein, having doubtless in his mind the words of our Lord concerning the Angels of the little ones, who always ‘behold the face of His Father in Heaven,’ he thus writes:—

‘Ah, little children, if ye knew
How angel-eyes in love
Look down upon you from the blue
Of the calm skies above,
Ye would be careful what ye do,
And eager to improve.

‘A joyous host, a countless band,
In robes of snowy white,
Around the throne, with harp in hand,
Take ever fresh delight,
Young tender souls to their sweet land
To beckon and invite.

‘They sorrow o’er you suffering,
They smooth your couch of sleep,
In danger’s hour they succour bring,
O’er you a watch they keep;
In you, then, ’twere a cruel thing
To make those blest ones weep.

The brightness of the noontide sun, the joyousness of spring,
only heightens the gloomy contrast as winds on

'In sad procession slow the funeral of a child.
I saw the little coffin borne unto its final rest,
The dark mould shovell'd o'er it, and replaced the daisied sod.'

Vol. i. p. 119.

And only once amid the dreary collection of images furnished by 'black rails, memorial-stones, strewed about,' (ii. 27,) vain sorrow over 'funeral urns,' (ii. 277,) 'the churchyard's yellow skull,' (323,) the 'mansion low and lone,' (53,) where 'above their bones unknowing, wild flowers and weeds are growing,' (327,) 'the angled bones, the sand-glass, and the scythe,' (i. 188,) do we meet with a passage which furnishes a pleasing contrast, and that is in telling of a foreign land, where

'Verdantly girded, sleeps a placid churchyard,
With many a cross to scare unholy shapes.'—Vol. ii. p. 174.

It would be well if the same description might be given of all the churchyards of this country.

As might reasonably be expected from a man who shows the loving and reverent feeling manifest in the extracts already given without a disposition to stunt the growth of natural feelings and desires when in accordance with the intimations of Holy Writ, there is a remarkable absence of that narrow-mindedness in religion which results in a continual proneness to sneer at methods and systems to which a man is himself a stranger,—that curious conceit which impels so many with much self-satisfaction to throw aside all consideration of many hundred years, which they are pleased to characterise as times of unmingled ignorance, darkness, and wickedness. Mr. Moir speaks with carefulness and guarded respect even on topics where we might fairly have made allowances for a very different tone,—so as to carry us back to the temper of pieces on similar subjects from the pen of Wordsworth, who stood on a vantage ground in respect of the more definite teaching to which he had access in the English Church. He can dwell with 'a solemn pleasure,' as he 'trode through the shadowy cloistral cells' of Dryburgh, on that pile, as having been—

'The abode
Of men, who could to solitude control
Their hopes,—yea! from Ambition's pathways stole,
To give their whole lives blamelessly to God,'—(Vol. i. p. 7.)

in the time when

'Night and morn,
From the near road the traveller heard arise
The hymn of gratulation and of praise;'—(Vol. i. p. 190.)

when—

‘ Veil’d religion
Bade the calm-brow’d Hermit roam,
Seeking with the lark and pigeon
Guilt-untroubled home.
Truly ’twas an erring choice,
If (as Reason says) be given
Earth preparative for Heaven,
And calm unclouded joys.
Nobler far ’tis sure to brave
Every barrier which retards us,
Than to craven Fear a slave,
Flee the path that Fate awards us.’—P. 78.

We cannot expect from Mr. Moir a sympathy for the Eremitic life wider than we might be disposed to accord to it ourselves; yet, while leaving without comment the matter contained in this passage, we cannot but advert to the manner in which it is worded, as involving a very dangerous principle; whatever he meant by saying, that Fate awards us our path in life, there is surely risk in allowing Reason to be the judicial tribunal in such a case. Certainly the natural man, guided only by his natural reason, would at once condemn so strange a departure from the ordinary practice of mankind; nay, from like grounds, even higher arguments might be brought against it,—that it defeats its own end, that it is unphilosophical, and the like. Milton advocated the early initiation into a knowledge of evil as a safeguard from being made a prey to the practice of it, on similar reasoning; but specious as all this may be, is it the mode of judgment employed in Holy Writ? Judging by our own reason, we should most probably have lauded Martha and chidden Mary. The pointed rebuke which was given to the former might surely show that there was some principle which, if we may so speak, guided our Lord in that declaration.

But however zealous a son of the Kirk Mr. Moir may have been, we have already shown that his own gentleness of disposition led him in some respects beyond the harsh and meagre dogmatism peculiar to that body; and being, therefore, somewhat at variance with it in his own convictions, we are not surprised to find him occasionally at variance also with himself. The whole tone of his mind appears to have been one, in great part, the growth of a teachable and loving disposition, not prone to useless arguments and disputes, or to a conscious manufacturing of one’s own belief; but, theoretically, he was a strenuous asserter of this principle, an exemplification of which occurs in the last cited passage, and was by it betrayed (wonderful were it had it been otherwise) into sundry strange inconsistencies. It is no new thing now; it has been matter of marvel often enough, that, seeing the frightful issues of this principle legitimately deve-

loped, men will yet speak of it as of a pearl of great price; and therefore we can but marvel once more at the fresh instance given us by Mr. Moir. Bearing in mind the untold horrors which continental Europe in times past witnessed from deluded fanatics, and the awful picture of frantic passions and boundless violence exhibited by the Scottish Covenanters, (be it that in its measure they had the palliation of self-defence,) every day multiplying itself with incalculable force, so as to realize in full the terrible delineation given by Bishop Butler of the passion of revenge, it is strange indeed to meet (in the preface to a 'Night Hymn of the Covenanters,' written in a rather similar manner to that of Sternhold and Hopkins,) with a defence of them, which, premising that 'the aggression emanated not from them,' and condemning their tremendous extravagances, still bids us remember 'that the rights they contended for were the most sacred and invaluable that man can possess,—the freedom of worshipping God according to the dictates of conscience. They sincerely believed that the principles which they maintained were right; and their adherence to these with unalterable constancy through good report and through bad report,—by the blood-stained hearth, on the scaffold, at the stake,—forms a noble chapter in the history of the human mind,—of man as an accountable creature.' (ii. 292.) Well might we then be proud of those so-termed martyrs, of whom the Arian in olden time gloried, and the Manichee made his boast. Most miserable delusion, the greatest perhaps of which the enemy of mankind has availed himself; nor can we wonder at the zeal wherewith the whole Eastern Church denounces the principle as itself involving all evil; for what can we say, but that in so far as they who avow it are preserved from excess, it is through God's providence in spite of that principle, and not in consequence of it? Nevertheless, Mr. Moir indites for the Covenanters the mild and peaceful declaration—

'Never to seek their homes again,
Never to give the sword its sheath,
Until our rights of Faith remain
Unfetter'd as the air we breathe.'—Vol. ii. p. 295.

He exults at the results following the persecutions of those—

'Who suffer'd tortures, bonds, and death
To free from mental thrall the land;'—Vol. ii. p. 347.

and that his lot had fallen 'on days of pleasant calm,' because

'In sacred as in civil rights we now
Are Freedom's children.'—Vol. ii. p. 40.

But, be it so, that this is a treasure of such countless value, and the possession of it so priceless a blessing, such passages read

ing which pervades and the lessons likely to be instilled by it, are the matters of by far the most consequence. A bad principle or an erroneous opinion, prettily given in verse, will, beyond doubt, bear with it more force than the same expressed in ordinary prose; and increase of power in the writing of course adds in proportion to its capabilities for leaving permanent impressions on the mind.

But we gladly turn to other portions of these volumes, where we shall discover the picture of a thoughtful and tender disposition developing itself, although in somewhat of sameness and want of power, yet in a pleasing readiness to avail itself of the teaching which is conveyed by the things that are seen and done around us. From the fact that these are mostly contributions to periodical literature, there are but few pieces amongst them which, from length or form, would challenge an especial observation apart from others; but they may be taken as falling mainly under certain heads, which both serve to show his poetical powers in the best light and bring the man himself before us in a pleasing aspect. His mind appears to have been essentially a retrospective one. The past must, more or less, obtrude itself from time to time on the memories of all; but with many, whether from outward circumstances or from buoyant health, the thought of it comes and passes away again, leaving them, as they were, fully taken up with and content in the present. This class of men furnishes perhaps the fewest poets, and may lay claim, if not to the highest happiness of which the mind is capable, yet perhaps to the smoothest tenor and most equable enjoyment of life. With others, the future displaces both the present and the past; the anticipation of joy or sorrow which come, the likelihood of failure or success, leave the mind in too disturbed a state to appreciate the teaching, whether of nature or of the events of human life. But Mr. Moir seems ever to have been looking back; the present chiefly reminds him that life is different from what it was at starting; the future (as it must needs do with a religious mind) carries his thoughts to the end of this life and the things which follow after it. Undoubtedly the past is the region of poetry; and the man that dwells in the past is, *à priori*, more likely to prove a poet; but something more is needed than the bare consciousness that years pass and life changes as one generation comes up after another. The impressions gained from a contemplation of the past must be varied; we do not like to be ever deriving the same lesson from any object which is capable of giving more. This something Mr. Moir seems to want: we accompany him to the haunts of his youth, to deserted churchyards, to the homes of poets, to

pleasant pastime, there is, perhaps, no reason why they should be kept away from an occupation which, in the case of domestic animals, falls to the lot of the cook or the butcher; but we do think that the pursuit of them is very inconsistent with that gentle tenderness for all things which cannot fail of being its own reward, which loves to see the lark poised on its exulting wing, and can listen to its ascending song, without the wish to see it lying bleeding and mangled at his feet. The sensibility of Cowper in this respect may be set aside as a morbid one, but we own to a feeling of satisfaction on finding that such were the thoughts, impressed by a precisely similar occasion, on a man strong in body as in mind, delighting in all active and manly pastimes, without anything which the world might be tempted to laugh down as mawkish squeamishness. The poem which narrates this contains also some pictures beautifully drawn, and will justify our extracting a portion of it. The writer speaks of times when he was

‘A little boy, and earth the realm of fairy-land.’

He sets off on a shooting excursion with a fowler, who was a visitor at his home, and whose joy he describes:—

‘The passion which lit up his brow, to con
The feats of sleight and cunning skill, by which
Their haunts were neared, or on the heathy hills,
Or mid the undergrove, on snowy moor,
Or by the misty lake, what time the dawn
Reddens the east, or from on high the moon
In the smooth water sees her pictured orb,
The white cloud slumbering in the windless sky,
And midnight mantling all the silent hills.’

It is early morning, still and calm—

‘There was no breath abroad; each in its cave
As if enchanted slept the winds, and left
Earth in a voiceless trance; around the porch
All stirlessly the darksome ivy clung;
All silently the leafless trees held up
Their bare boughs to the sky; the atmosphere,
Untroubled in its cold serenity,
Wept icy dews; and now the later stars,
As by some hidden necromantic charm
Dilate amid the death-like calm profound
Upon the slumber-mantled earth look down.

In the far west the Pentland’s gloomy ridge
Belted the pale blue sky, whereon a cloud
Fantastic, grey, and tinged with solemn light,
Lay, like a dreaming monster; and the moon
Waning, above its silvery rim upheld
Her horns, as ’twere the spectre of the past!

Silently, silently, on, on we trode,
 As if a spell had frozen up our words :
 White lay the woods around us, ankle deep
 In new fallen snow, which champ'd beneath our tread ;
 And by the marge of winding Eske, which show'd
 The mirror'd stars upon its map of ice,
 Downwards in haste we journey'd to the shore
 Of ocean, whose drear multitudinous voice
 Unto the listening spirit of silence sang.

'Twere sad to tell our murderous deeds that morn :
 Silent upon the chilly beach we lay
 Prone, while the drifting snow-flakes o'er us fell
 Like Nature's frozen tears for our misdeeds
 Of wanton cruelty. The eider-ducks,
 With their wild eyes and necks of changeful blue,
 We watch'd now diving down, now on the surge
 Flapping their pinions, of our ambuscade
 Unconscious, till a sudden death was found ;
 While floating o'er us, in the graceful curves
 Of silent beauty, down the sea-mew fell :
 The gilimot upon the shellbank lay
 Bleeding, and oft in wonderment its mate
 Flew round with mournful cry to bid it rise,
 Then shrieking fled afar : the sand-pipers,
 A tiny flock, innumerable, as round
 And round they flew, bewail'd their broken ranks,
 And the scared heron sought his inland marsh.
 With blood-bedabbled plumes around us rose
 A slaughter'd hecatomb ; and to my heart
 (My heart then open to all sympathies)
 It spoke of tyrannous cruelties, of man
 The desolator : and of some far day,
 When the accountable shall make account,
 And but the merciful shall mercy find.
 Soul-sicken'd, satiate, and dissatisfied,
 An altered being homewards I return'd,
 My thoughts revolting at the thirst for blood,
 So brutalizing, so destructive of
 The finer sensibilities which man
 In boyhood owns, and which the world destroys.
 Nature had preach'd a sermon to my heart,
 And from that moment, on that snowy morn,
 (Seeing that earth enough of suffering has
 And death) all cruelty my soul abhorr'd,—
 Yea, loathed the purpose and the power to kill.'—Vol. i. p. 72.

It is in these, the recollections, pleasant or scrowful, of his early days, that Mr. Moir's poems exhibit the freshness, purity, and simplicity of his mind. We have not, indeed, as we have before noticed, much indication of great power, but his life was thoroughly taken up with the discharge of active duties, and a happy and contented mind did not often lead him into profound and abstruse inquiries ; but whenever his own personal reminiscences are told to us, there is always a most pleasing fresh-

ness of thought, with smoothness and elegance of style; and indeed we may divide all the poems into two classes,—the one containing the description of his own personal feelings and recollections, or actions or events which in some way had reference to himself; the other being (in a stricter sense of the term than the ordinary one) fancy pieces. Amongst those of the latter class are a great number apparently addressed by the poet to an imaginary person; and there seems a very great likelihood that such pieces will not only fall into a great monotony of treatment, but also will show very great unreality. It is otherwise in a set tale; there the several characters speak in their own persons, and the circumstances in which they are placed furnish the clue to the particular strain of thought; but there is no such guide for us when we meet with poems addressed to 'Inez in absence,' to 'Inez in remembrance;' or effusions 'On the Death of Ida;' and we are driven to suppose that they are facts belonging to his own history, and that he was of the number of those who have to look back on the memory of some absent or departed one, with whom had he

'Never met and never parted,
He had ne'er been broken-hearted;'

but the narrative of his life precludes this supposition. Married at a comparatively early period of life, he seems to have been united to the object of his first love, from whom he was never afterwards separated; so that, in default of this hypothesis, we are led to conclude (and the sameness of style the more inclines us so to do) that the writer sat down to compose verses to some one whom he imagined himself to have loved and lost; and how can a man be well expected (unaided by the concurring circumstances of a tale which may really rouse his sympathy and enable him in a degree to realize the requisite state of feeling) to create in his own heart a blank, making life a void, and to delineate sorrows in himself which do not exist? A man, happy in his love, and happy in his home, may easily narrate the sufferings of the broken-hearted; but he can scarcely, without becoming unreal, attempt to make himself the subject of those same feelings. It is easier, perhaps, to realize an imaginary condition of sorrow than of joy; but to realize either fully, there must be personal experience, or else the writer must distinctly set before himself some other person from whom those feelings are to be described as coming. But this sameness occurs, not only in the kind of poems just mentioned, but also in most of the pieces suggested by celebrated Scottish localities. These are little more than either mere glorifications of great deeds done, or more frequently, meditations on the lapse of

time and the changes consequent, and pictures of the sorrow and misery resulting, whether on defeat or victory.

' We'll hear nae mair liting at the ewe milking,
Women and bairns are heartless and wae,
Sighing and moaning on ilka green loaming,
The flowers of the forest are a' wede away;'

is a touching picture of what must be the sequel of every battle-field; but there is sameness, nevertheless, when we find that one field suggests almost the same train of thoughts with another; and the charge remains, whatever be the merits of the versification. This we have already mentioned as being almost always very smooth, careful, and polished; but we must be suffered to say a few words on the subject of rhyme and rhythm. The present school of poets seems to have paid especial attention to the latter; no one more so than Mr. Tennyson; and it seems to us that this elaborate and guarded carefulness that there shall never be a break in the rhythm, no one line with a different scanning or cæsura from another, is one of the means which produce the great smoothness of his poetry, while, at the same time, they take off from its power. But Mr. Tennyson, so careful in rhythm, is not always equally guarded as to his rhymes; a defect which to us seems greater than an occasional halting or ruggedness in the lines themselves. The subject is one which, so far as we can judge, does not seem to have engaged Mr. Moir's attention; but a naturally musical ear has prevented either much harshness in his pieces, or much bad rhyming. There are certainly occasional blemishes,—cæsuras in the wrong foot, adjectives occurring at the end of a line with their substantives in the following one, but more frequently in the matter of rhymes,—for we cannot consider, as such, collocations like the following; 'thwarts—departs;' 'claws—was,' and many others; such rhymes as 'childhood' with 'wildwood' are questionable;—but infelicity of rhyming cannot very well exceed that of the following stanza:—

' And art thou gone? I deem'd thee some
Immortal essence,—art thou gone?
I saw thee laid within the tomb,
And I am left to mourn alone;
Once to have loved, is to have loved
Enough; and what with thee I proved,
Again I'll seek in none;—'(vol. ii. p. 236;)

which, strictly speaking, is blank verse; and this defect is a far worse one than a verse halting or broken; the unvarying sameness of cadence, in Mr. Tennyson's poetry for example, is by no means inviting; it seems an iron bondage, which in the ten

syllable line, for instance, would limit us to a succession of iambs, condemning the rhythm of such a line as

‘O’er the glad waters of the dark blue sea,’

and seeking to keep us to such a monotone as is furnished by much of Gray’s *Elegy*. Surely a cadence occasionally varied may be of great service, if not employed so often as to degenerate into a fault.

But we do not wish to be understood as speaking of Mr. Moir in a tone of depreciation: gladly, therefore, in parting with him, we turn to dwell upon his beauties only,—his love for the sights and sounds of nature, his tenderness for all living things. We catch the tone of that thought in Wordsworth’s exquisite ode,

‘Yet I know

Where’er I go,

That there hath passed away a glory from the earth,’

in the following lines on the Harebell:—

‘Though it be that now thou art
But as a memory to my heart,—
Though years have flown, and in their flight
Turn’d hope to sadness, bloom to blight,
And I am changed,—yet thou art still
The same bright blossom of the hill,
Catching within thy cup of blue
The summer light and evening dew:
Yea, though the wizard Time hath wrought
Strange alteration in my lot,
Though what unto my youthful sight
Appear’d most beautiful and bright,
(The morning star, the silver dew,
Heaven’s circling arch of cloudless blue,
And setting suns above the head
Of ragged mountains blazing red,)
Have of their glory lost a part,
As worldly thoughts o’erran the heart,
Still, what of yore thou were to me,
Blithe boyhood seeks and finds in thee;—
As on the sward reclined he lies,
Shading the sunshine from his eyes,
He sees the lark with twinkling wings
For ever soaring as she sings,
And listens to the tiny rill
Amid its hazels murmuring still,
The while thou bloomest by his knee.’—Vol. i. p. 150.

His favourite subject of change and decay is pleasingly brought before us in the following lines to the *Sycamore*:—

‘The frail yellow leaves, they are falling
As the wild winds sweep the grove:
Plashy and dank is the sward beneath,
And the sky it is grey above;

Another, equally graphic, is where, from the Slopes of Inveresk, he

‘gazed down
Upon the frith of Forth, whose waveless tide
Glow’d like a plain of fire. In majesty
O’er-canopied with many-vestured clouds,
The mighty sun, low in the furthest West,
With orb dilated, o’er the Grampian chain
Mountain up-piled on mountain, huge and blue,
Was shedding his last rays adown the shores
Of Fife, with all its towns and woods and fields,
And bathing Ben Ean and Benledi’s peaks
In hues of amethyst. Ray after ray,
From the twin Lomond’s conic heights declined
And died away the glory; and at length,
As sank the last low horizontal beams,
And twilight drew her azure curtain round,
From out the South twinkled the evening star.’—Vol. ii. p. 360.

We could easily and gladly give many other descriptions of equal merit, scattered through these poems, but that our space warns us to hurry on. Passages of greater force and power we do not think they contain, but we linger with pleasure in the company of a poet who so walks and converses with nature, not only noting all her changes and characteristics, but who draws lessons so healthful and so true from her teaching, who discerns that

‘Meanings profounder, loftier lie
In all we see, in all we hear,
Than merely strike the common eye,
Than merely meet the careless ear.
And meekly man must bend his knee
On Nature’s temple floor, if he
Would master her philosophy.’—Vol. i. p. 141.

It is no disparagement that a mightier poet has set forth the same truth before. Ages and men have alike their office to perform; and a careful examination and minute and loving portraiture of the things that are seen and heard around us is perhaps the chief characteristic of our more recent poetry; and in so far, therefore, it is accomplishing a good work.

Thus then we take leave of a man, in the perusal of whose poems we have spent many a pleasant hour; feeling thankful that an example of so much gentleness, humility, and reverence, has been furnished to us by a religious system from which such growths are unfortunately but too rare; and in taking leave of him, we cannot help citing his own opinion on the subject of which the opening remarks of this article have treated. ‘Depend upon it,’ is an expression in one of his letters, ‘whenever a writer is obscure, he is weak; and when you do come to a hidden meaning, it is not worth knowing.’ Were this maxim

to be applied at once in its full force to Mr. Reade's poetry, the sentence passed on it must needs be a hard one; but obscurity and mystery are ugly sounding words, and, therefore, before charging a writer with them, it is fitting to know precisely what meaning we attach to them. Obscurity, after all, as we before noticed, is but a relative term; and it is impossible that every subject can be treated of with the same clearness and easiness. Some questions are in their own nature more abstruse than others; and no charge of obscurity in such subjects can be entertained when coming from persons who never think at all.

Such was the defence against this same charge of the greatest perhaps of our moral philosophers, when desirous of explaining whom he considered fit judges whether his arguments 'might have been put in a plainer manner;' 'which yet,' he adds, 'I am very far from asserting that they could not.' And, therefore, it might be urged, in defence of Mr. Reade, that he has to treat of subjects in themselves involving great difficulty and wrapped in great obscurity. But this allegation must be itself discussed in its own place; we must examine whether the subjects treated of are really so very dark and dimly known as they are in these volumes represented to be; meanwhile we revert to the judgment of the same writer on morals, from whom we have quoted, that, 'it is very unallowable for a work of imagination or entertainment not to be of easy comprehension.' The entertainment, perhaps, which the present writer would set before his readers, may be of a more recondite character; and therefore we would desire to the very utmost to allow for the obscurity attendant on the medium of language which conveys it.

We have already mentioned the very strong contrast apparent between Mr. Reade and Mr. Moir, and taken them as examples of two entirely different types of intellectual development, of minds which are perpetually apt to look at the same object in very different aspects. It is not unreasonable therefore to look for a corresponding difference between them in point of style and language; and, also, before pressing any charge of unintelligible or harsh or obscure wording, we desire to bear in mind the caution of perhaps the greatest and best critic in matters of poetry, (however his own practice may have differed from his rules,)—we mean Wordsworth,—'that the critic ought 'never to forget that he himself is exposed to the same errors 'as the poet, and perhaps in a much greater degree; for there 'can be no presumption in saying of most readers, that it is not 'probable they will be so well acquainted with the various 'stages of meaning through which words have passed, or with 'the fickleness or stability of the relations of particular ideas to

‘each other.’ But it has been already allowed that men of this abstract and argumentative stamp of mind may very possibly use expressions which seem strange and obscure to others, attaching to them a real meaning, and that this meaning may be a fixed one in their own minds; and therefore it would be necessary to look with all deference on apparently misty passages, and to ponder well whether the defect be in the writer, or rise from one’s own want of acquaintance with the particular idea. In other words, poetry in which this kind of thought abounds, entails on the unlearned in this branch the acquisition of a separate science, in default of a lexicon which may at once settle the meaning of words as employed by such writers. Yet after all we must be permitted to ask one question:—How far is it right to introduce so much obscurity, so much of difficult and abstruse thought into poetry? nay rather, how far is it consistent with the existence of poetry itself? The poet seeks to have weight with other men, to influence them, to move them; and so far as he is one, he succeeds in so doing, because, in Wordsworth’s admirable description, ‘he is a man speaking to men,—a man, it is true, endowed with a more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge of human nature and a more comprehensive soul, than are supposed to be common among mankind; a man pleased with his own passions and volitions, and who rejoices more than other men in the spirit of life that is in him,—delighting to contemplate similar volitions and passions as manifested in the goings on of the universe, and habitually impelled to create them where he does not find them.’ And just for this very reason he must speak as other men speak; he must give utterance to his thoughts in a language intelligible, not only to himself and to men of a precisely similar mind with himself, because, to cite the same great judge, ‘Poets do not write for poets alone, but for men; unless therefore we are advocates for that admiration which subsists upon ignorance, and that pleasure which arises from hearing what we do not understand, the poet must descend from this supposed height; and, in order to excite rational sympathy, must express himself as other men express themselves.’ But it is time that we should show what we mean with respect to the present poems.

There is a phraseology, of which we are not aware that many specimens exist of more than recent date, at all events among English writers; the metaphysical Germans appear to have been mainly instrumental in rearing the fabric, so far as hardness of style and diction and continual abstractions are concerned; its introduction into English literature may, in a very great degree, be laid at the doors of Mr. Carlyle. We own to

no great liking for the continual personification of abstract qualities, or pleasure in receiving such information as that Abject Fear, looking out of the window, beholds Consternation prostrate upon the pavement. We cannot admire the exceeding harshness, stiffness, and frigidity of style resulting from it; when driven to the perusal of it, we are, as it were, walking in a strange land,—the plants and trees are of uncouth and fantastic growth, the very skies assume a different hue, the clouds a different form, and the human habitants therein live in a world of thought of which we can scarcely consider ourselves the denizens. This phraseology, whether adopted from others, or the growth of his own mind, is the staple of Mr. Reade's diction. It occurs in such profusion, that it is impossible to do more than to give a few almost random instances,—compound words, such as 'thought-utterances,' (i. 15,) 'ray-emanations,' 'knowledge-thankfulness,' (ii. 294,) 'winds cloud-folded,' 'cloud-congregations,' (ii. 336,) 'sense-penance,' (i. 207,) 'heart-emanations,' (i. 58,) 'heart-flowers,' 'man-image,' (i. 212,) and divers others. It is difficult to see why Greek and German idioms should be foisted on the unwilling English language. It so happens that the Greek use of the article and substantive, embracing a number of words between them, is also the German usage; yet it would not be pleasant to come across such an expression in our own tongue as, for example, 'the by the Persians against the Greeks boldly carried on war;' yet in itself the latter seems little more ridiculous than these newly-coined compound words. Of what has, before now, received the name of Adverbial Philosophy there also is abundance; plenty of 'the beautiful,' 'the bodiless all,' 'the indwelling,' 'the inane,' 'the known,' 'the unknown,' 'the understood,' 'the uncompromising real,' 'the ineffable,' 'the unchangeable,' 'the mutable,' 'the one,' 'the now and then.' Some of these, as 'the mutable,' are presented in every possible shape,—

'Forms whose name is mutability.'—i. 117.

Memnon

'Stands above the uproar,
Calm, lofty, massive, and immutable.'—i. 235.

Prometheus on the rock is

'Stern, rigid, motionless, immutable.'—i. 277.

Yet again the change is rung on the same sounds,—

'We live
Among things mutable: what else our lives?
But mutability is the robe of life
That vestures the immutable.'—ii. 353.

But it would be superfluous to multiply examples, such as

‘The throbbing pulse of mutability,’ &c.

Another very favourite word is ‘humanity,’ or more frequently in the plural number; as, for instance, Memnon says,—

‘Fallen as we are, we have not
Forgotten our humanities;’—(i. 226;)

which most unwillingly forces on our memory the course of studies pursued by Dugald Dalgetty at the Marischal College of Aberdeen. We are told to

‘Live among humanities.’—i. 304.

‘Humanities bind man to the universal soul of human kind.’—ii. 386.

Again;

‘Our confessional another lacks
Ere we compare humanities.’—ii. 334.

The ambition of Prometheus

‘Could not descend into the pale of our humanities,’ &c. &c.—i. 277.

A volcano is said to

‘Tongue red fires.’—ii. 96.

Seas are ‘entempested;’ pride ‘in safe distance spheres its impotence;’ the soul is spoken of as ‘spread o’er the metropolitan world,’ (ii. 314;) we are said to be ‘slaves to motiving necessity,’ (ii. 323;) praise and blame, virtue and vice, are ‘sounds of signs made powers,’ (ii. 324.) Men gazing on a sunset, ‘felt its beauty entering their visual being,’ (ii. 370.) But it is needless to multiply examples further, of words strangely compounded, or employed in unusual meanings. Most probably, in the issue, the English language will vindicate itself from such alien usages and combinations, and this array of newly-born phrases sink into the ‘measureless inane;’ a far greater blot is the incorrectness of style which accompanies them. The rules of grammar are sufficiently stringent in prose; we have not learnt that they may be dispensed with in poetry, and that the latter will admit an endless assemblage of ellipses, will suffer verbs, relatives, participles, conjunctions, to be left out at the will of the writer; yet there is scarcely a page of these volumes that does not furnish several instances of one or more of these omissions and solecisms. Participles are omitted in absolute constructions:—

‘I have mused among grey wrecks of men,
Unknown the hands that rear’d.’—ii. 281.

‘Feeding on the outward forms
Of beautiful things, their inner meaning veil’d.’—ii. 287.

from the astonishing number of harsh passages, and passages ambiguous and obscure, and some, we confess, to us utterly unintelligible. Once more we must repeat what has been already cited, that poets do not write for poets alone, but for men; and we only desire to claim our fair share of consideration, when we assert that we have given every one of these passages a diligent and earnest attention; we have taken some of them one way and then another, oftentimes altogether in vain; in many of them, whether from the frequent ellipses or from the abstruseness of the ideas, the constant abstract images, or from strange combinations of words, it might be difficult to tell,—but the very words, as they stand forth in type, assume the character of dissolving views, and seem to bear a different meaning every time that the eye rests upon them. We must cite a few instances, at the risk of being wearisome. What are we to make of the harmony and perspicuity of the following?

‘Patroclus risen sunlike, blazing in Pilides’ arms array’d,
The rally, rout, the lightning hero by the Lycian monarch stay’d,
The sire God veil’d his prescient vision,’ &c.—i. 89.

Language could scarcely be harsher than—

‘So time rolls on; states, faiths trace paths renew’d;’—(ii. 58;)

or than—

‘The human flowers,—
For what love, hope, faith, but flowers we cherish?
Blighted,’ &c.—(ii. 299.)

or more obscure than the following:—

‘*Cain*. What were these broken masses rounded like
The trunks of trees, of dazzling whiteness, traced
With unknown imagings?
Lucifer. The pillars of the dwellings of earth’s kings,
Built to impress substantial memories
On breath of men; to stamp on mutable clay
A power and feeling of the immutable;
Man’s pride reveal’d, wrestling with destiny
All vainly; but in softer hearts a yearning
Toward those left; a sigh to leave behind
But human memories; thou seest the crowns
They wore, when man bow’d down and worshipped them.’—i. 51.

Whatever be the meaning of the whole, it is not easy to see how a memory can be impressed on the breath. Or again (speaking of Prometheus):—

‘What his reward for all he taught and suffer’d?
The worn-out hope, the fear, the doubt, despair
Returning on him still, rocklike repelled
By that impenetrable spirit. These
The harvests, whē’—’—ops of blood;

This the base height attained to open on
 Waste desolation, the Tantalean thirst
 Unslaked that lives beyond the grave,
 The fabled vultures that do prey upon
 Engenderings of the heart which they have baffled.'—i. 277.

We confess the passage baffles us. With equal obscurity does the writer speak of the extinction of the Greek mythology :—

' They live no more, those idols of the heart,
 Those earliest abstractions of our thought,
 Pure offspring of the soul's immortal part,
 That animated life material wrought
 From its own quickening essence over-fraught
 Into the beautiful with which it strove ;
 The emanation from founts unforget,
 Creation of the soul's o'erflowing love,
 That bodied earthly Gods from archetypes above.'—ii. 81.

Again, we are told, on the same subject, that

' Sun-haired Apollo sinks from his red car ;
 Progressive faculty the God had found,
 Whose shadow was his glory.'

But there are many others, where we fail of discerning even the partial meaning which we perceive in those already given. The poet is speaking of the arch of Titus, and asks,—

' Deem ye the Hebrew slave who graved his tale
 Of slavery there, felt not his creed should still prevail ;
 That the mock'd symbols of a faith accursed
 Should crown yon altar places desolate,
 The fondest, latest by religion nursed :
 When 'Truth should point her path to heaven, and Fate
 Become a word to raise the smile sedate ;
 When the gods multi-form should bow to one ?
 Lo ! there the victors on the vanquish'd wait ;
 The secrets of their creed revealed in stone,
 Once heathens' scorn and gibe while lightly passing on.'—ii. 57.

And yet more—:

' Oh, little do the cold world apprehend
 The anticipating fear, hope, conscious doubt
 Of youthful aspiration ! restless yearning
 For fame, whose aching thirst is happiness :
 The entrance in her temple, awe-impress'd
 By the sedate and solemn potencies
 Enthroned there ; brows the records high
 And august thought that made of human names
 Virtues, the consciousness of distance felt.'—291.

And in similar way :—

' Yet I fed meditation, watching sin :
 I gazed upon the face, until the eye,
 Projecting light, the tongue that falsehood phrased,

And liveried subtleties came forth unheard;
Then while with vision open'd I look'd in
The speaker's visible soul,—then while I loathed
The human tree whereon I grew.'—ii. 297;

And likewise:—

'It was upon a winter's stormy night
Her missive came to see myself and daughter; '—(ii. 362,)

(which, from the sequel, is shown to mean, 'Her missive came, saying, that she wished to see myself and my daughter.')

We could fill many a page with examples of a like kind, but the foregoing may suffice to show how obscure the writing of this author can be. Obscurity is almost sure to involve harshness; and whenever Mr. Reade speaks after the manner of Mr. Carlyle, he is always harsh and cramped in his diction, as well as very frequently uncouth and inelegant in his versification. There are frequent instances of infelicitous rhymes, as in a Spenserian stanza, 'forth,' 'wrath,' 'worth,' and 'path,' are supposed to rhyme with each other. But Mr. Reade has also many peculiarities of prosody; words occur scanned differently in different places. Sometimes he gives 'vibrātēst,' sometimes 'vibrātēst;,' sometimes 'cōntēmplāting,' at others, 'cōntēmplāting;,' 'hour,' 'flower,' 'heaven,' and other words, almost invariably counted for monosyllables, are scanned as two; 'frailty' almost always occurs as a trisyllabic word; and more strangely still, we meet with 'inspiring' and 'enkindling' as words of four syllables, as in—

'A spirit here, its ruin shall outlast,
Inspiring the air; the skeleton,' &c.—ii. 53.

As also there are several strange expressions, as—

'Earthly passion that its throne hath chose.'—ii. 75.

'Laid, is put for 'lay:':—

'We had rounded the ribb'd hill,
Where opening from beneath a valley laid,
Embosom'd among mountains.'—(ii. 335.)

or for 'lain,' as—

'Thou hast pass'd,—
Lo, how thy shadow on the ground hath laid!'

And there are several such as the following:—

'So did he feel how vain
To realize his boyhood's hope again,
Till refuging from self-made tyranny,'—ii. 109.

'Forsook' is given for 'forsaken;,' again there is—

'Died for such as me.'—ii. 339.

But if he is minute in describing their form, he is no less careful to imbibe their teaching:—

‘ I have felt
In all their gentleness they have a voice
Deeper than that of mountains or of floods ;
Life’s opening germ, youth’s blossoming, decline
And fall of age their holy lips reveal ;
They teach us how to live, and how to die,
Shedding their purity on us with their breath :
There quaffs the insect from his cup, and parts
Contented : there the sacred dews of heaven
Are caught and cherished ; when their hour is done
They quietly surrender up to Nature
Their beautiful being.’—ii. 276.

It is remarkable, that on such subjects, and on all where he gives utterance to the genuine feelings of the heart, there is almost a total absence of the harsh, strained, and obscure diction, with dark and almost unintelligible thought, which elsewhere germinates in such rank fertility. In vigour of thought, indeed, and power of language, Mr. Reade far surpasses Mr. Moir; and where he deigns to descend from the lofty heights of abstract research, we have passages of mingled beauty and strength, deserving to be ranked amongst the highest efforts of the poetic mind; the most remarkable, perhaps, being in the delineation of the affections of love, or gentleness, or sorrow; and of which we shall have occasion to notice some instances of almost faultless elegance and sweetness. Both the poets, also, have the same theory regarding the permanent authority of human reason, as the fountain-head from which all belief springs, and the ultimate tribunal from whose decisions there is no appeal; but with this important practical difference,—that Mr. Moir professes a zeal for what we make bold to say was by no means the ruling guide of his own life, and the source of his own convictions; Mr. Reade unhappily begins as though the mind were a *tabula rasa*,—all things dark, all things uncertain, with reason alone to follow up each fitful and flickering gleam until, if so be, he may be fortunate enough to reach some definite and sure ground at the last. And however crude and incorrect may be Mr. Moir’s opinions as to the condition of fallen man,—however he may appear to think that the soul of man after the fall could hold communion with God even as before, and that the mind, although corrupted, of itself and immediately, was able to rise to the throne of Him who is infinite in purity as in justice;—however glimpses of such notions, (abundantly contradicted, happily, by the real faith and practice of the man) may, in a few places, be discerned;—Mr. Reade does not seem to be aware that the condition of man after the

The latter is a poem in four parts, or cantos, containing the author's descriptions of places and things which he saw in that country, and his sentiments and reflections upon them, and which, if it contains some of the obscurest and harshest passages to be found in these volumes, presents also many examples of his highest excellences. It is not certainly ground trodden for the first time; there are few that have not perused the pleasant pages of Mr. Rogers; fewer still who are not acquainted with '*Childe Harold*;' with the former the present poem has no similarity, but it is upon the whole, in its plans, only an enlargement of the fourth canto of the latter. Very many of the objects are taken in precisely the same order, and frequently also suggest the same course of thought. It is far from being our wish to accuse the writer of plagiarism, or to urge against him that he should not have attempted to treat of subjects already handled by others with consummate skill and power. Clearly there is the same freedom still to all to wander through these same scenes, and to give their judgments and thoughts concerning them to the world, if they are worth the having. Italy itself can never become hackneyed, any more than any place can, which is hallowed by countless associations and memorials of ages past, and on which the hand of God has poured forth so rich a flood of beauty; and reasonably, also, we may expect that the contemplation of the same object may suggest similar expressions to different minds according as they approach each other in power and activity. We can have no reason, therefore, to murmur that another delineation has been given to us of Florence, of Rome, of Terni, of Dante, Petrarch, Tasso, of St. Peter's, the Pantheon, the Colosseum; but the comparison instantly arises in the mind, between this poem and that of the mighty bard, who has left us more to sorrow for than to admire. Any one who writes of Santa Croce, or of those who there lie buried, of Venice and all its fallen beauty, must be conscious that he is drawing this comparison upon himself, even though he display sufficient originality of mind to exempt him from any further imputation of wearing borrowed plumes. Mr. Reade's plan brings out more fully a defect discernible in a measure in '*Childe Harold*'—abruptness, namely, in passing from one object to another, more especially when these are works of art. There is the Venus de Medici, and the Laöcoon, and the Apollo Belvedere, and the Gladiator, and all with a stanza or two apportioned to them, until we fancy ourselves reading a very musical catalogue in metre. On these several works as on others, the ideas of Mr. Reade show a marked and close agreement with those of Lord Byron; with him he almost adores the Venus de Medici, and bows down before the horrors of the Laocoön. It

And again—

'The Paradise of Italy, the bower
And throne of luxury; where the air breathed love
And passionate feeling, making life's brief hour
One long enjoyment.'—ii. 100.

'Clarens, sweet Clarens, birthplace of deep love,
Thine air is the young breath of passionate thought,
Thy trees take root in love,' &c.—*Childe Harold*.

Or again, of the sea—

'Thou mirrorest the Infinite on thy breast,
In thy all fathomless depths is typed the Almighty's rest.'—ii. 116.

'Thou glorious mirror where the Almighty's form
Glasses itself in tempest: in all time
The image of eternity, the throne
Of the Invisible.'—*Childe Harold*.

We might have been disposed to think that a poet would shrink from handling one or two subjects which have produced some matchless passages of 'Childe Harold'; yet he does not hesitate to

'Pause, when like a steadfast exhalation,
O'er yon green bank Clitumnus rears his shrine:
Is that all delicate temple the creation
Of human hands? as clasps the elm the vine,
The sculptured leaves around those columns twine.'—ii. 35.

Surely there is not music here equal to the melody which sings of Clitumnus,—

'The sweetest wave
Of the most living crystal that was e'er
The haunt of river nymph;'

where

'On thy happy shore a temple still
Of small and delicate proportion keeps,
Upon a mild declivity of hill,
Its memory of thee.'—*Childe Harold*.

We have not quoted the remainder of Mr. Reade's stanza; we refrain, therefore, from adding the lines of faultless beauty which close that of Lord Byron.

There are many similar instances, as in the stanzas in the *Thrasymene*, the *Falls of Terni*, the *Fountain of Egeria*; but there are likewise pictures of great beauty, which at the same time are entirely original. We are led to Venice, when

'The sun is setting: his last rays are steeping
In golden hues yon clouds that steadfast keep
Their station, on the blue horizon sleeping,
Breasting the sky yet blending with the deep;
Lo! from their braided edges glittering creep
Sharp pointed spires, in blue air faintly shown,
O'er-shadow'd as the sea mists round them sweep;
Away! those shadows are to substance grown,
For Venice there doth sit upon her ocean throne.'—ii. 22.

'Lo! there the moon sleeps, flooding that white ground,
 Paling with ghastly sheen each column's height,
 While the gigantic circle yawns around,
 Drear, silent, savage, through which, twinkling bright,
 Shine stars like eyes: and strange and solemn sight,
 The illimitable space yawns blackly o'er:
 Yet who would see that pile in beauty's light,
 Be it not silver'd thus by moonlight o'er,
 But when departing Day adds there one glory more.
 For with that ruin and the dying day,
 Are human sympathies man more can feel:
 The red light magnifies its grand decay,
 Hallowing the wounds which it would not conceal:
 Tints that are harmonies then round it steal,
 Hues which are Nature's feeling for the past:
 Doth she not ever such with time reveal,
 And on the wreck her nameless magic cast,
 Religion of the place that shall grey faiths outlast?'—69.

We hear much of grey faiths elsewhere, stated in so unqualified a manner, as almost to make us suspect that the writer has some notion of the possibility of the Christian faith following the same course. But for the present we must leave such topics.

We have already noticed resemblances between 'Italy' and 'Childe Harold'; we must speak differently of those which are to be found between the two dramas of 'The Deluge' and 'Destiny,' and the dramas of 'Heaven and Earth' and 'Cain' of Lord Byron, more especially in the former. The whole plan and argument of 'The Deluge' is so completely identical with that of 'Heaven and Earth,' the characters introduced speak throughout in so similar a strain, the very order of the scenes is so entirely the same, the very opinions bear so strong a correspondence, that it is most difficult to see what possible motive the writer could have had in composing it. We are not imputing plagiarism, or denying that there are many parts of most exceeding tenderness and pathos; but we must maintain that there is nothing here which is not contained in 'Heaven and Earth,' albeit at not so great length; and, moreover, that the impression left on the mind after perusing each is, as regards the moral statements contained in them, precisely the same. There are indeed different names assigned; in each, contradicting the account of Holy Writ, one of the sons of Noah is represented as unmarried at the time of the deluge, and moreover as unsuccessful in his love: in 'Heaven and Earth' he keeps the name of Japheth, in the 'Deluge' he receives that of Irad; in both there is a friend of this son of Noah, similarly circumstanced, called by Lord Byron Irad, but here Hammon. There are two sisters, one of whom Irad (*i.e.* Japheth) wishes to gain as his wife, who have chosen as their lovers two angels; these Mr. Reade calls Astarte and Azoara, who in every single feature of

'Fare thee well,—yet wherefore
Say I that word to thee still ever near me?
When thy light footsteps are no longer heard,
The falling leaf is as that well-known sound;
When I depart, I see thee still, thy presence
Light-like is round me; when I hear thee not,
I can create thy voice, while memory
Lives on its echoes: when I turn from thee
I leave thee not, thine image fills my being,
My body's soul that else were tenantless.'—P. 113.

Irad departs, and Azoara entering, the sisters converse as in the opening of 'Heaven and Earth.' Astarte is scrupulous; Azoara chides her—

'Live,
As Lillah lives with Hammon: toil and spin;
Tend children, flocks and herds; shut up thy soul
From all communion with the life beyond.'—P. 114.

Even as, for like reason, Aholibamah tells Anah—

'Wed thee
Unto some son of clay, and toil and spin;
There's Japheth loves thee well, hath loved thee long:
Marry and bring forth dust.'

And as Astarte, speaking of her angel lover, says—

'I feel our ties unhallow'd,
Our meetings are perturb'd, unlike the calm
That comes with Irad; consciousness withal
Of erring felt;'—(p. 115.)

so Anah, with less harshness of expression, says—

'I love our God less since his angel loved me:
This cannot be of good.'

Astarte

'Sighs, remembering her mortality—
Feeling when he must mourn the child of dust,
Turning to heaven forgetting her for ever;'—(p. 118.)

Anah, more true we think to womanly love, says—

'I pity him,
His grief will be of ages, or at least
Mine would be such for him, were I the seraph
And he the perishable.'

Azoara is more lofty—

'We are immortal and we feel it; we
May die, but cannot perish: to forget
Is impotence unknown to heavenly nature.'—P. 118.

As, similarly, Aholibamah—

'Feels' her 'immortality o'ersweep
All pains, all tears, all time, all fears.'

‘ Yet, yet, oh fly :
 Ye cannot die,
 But they
 Shall pass away,
 While ye shall fill with shrieks the upper sky
 For perishable clay.’

‘ We will bear ye far
 To some untroubled star,
 Where thou and Anah shall partake our lot.’
 ‘ The moment cometh to approve thy strength :
 And learn at length
 How vain to war with what thy God commands.
 Thy former force was in thy faith.’

The flood is nearer still. Irad soliloquises in strains similar to those of Japheth; the sisters and the angels begin to feel the coming judgment; the Archangel summons Israphil and Oraziel away,—they refuse: the waters rise; death and ruin are gulping all on every side; the passions of men are let loose,—some frantic, some blaspheming, one acknowledging the justice of God, in terms more fully drawn out, indeed, but in meanings precisely similar to those of the closing portion of ‘Heaven and Earth.’ The whole is very powerful and very painful; pathos can scarcely exceed that of the following, which we are compelled to extract, albeit at some length, on account of its exceeding beauty. Astarte is taking her last look at the home and haunts of her childhood:—

‘ Farewell,
 Beautiful Earth, where I no more must dwell :
 Farewell the dim and leafy places, where
 These eyes first open’d on the azure air,
 And drank in all the glories of the day,
 Stamp’d in my heart that cannot pass away,
 The voiceful love and life in it that dwells,
 The gladness of the gracious Earth which swells
 Upward, while welcoming the light it loved,
 Hues shed from God upon his work approved.
 The stars outlooking when the sun had set,
 As if they fear’d their eyes I should forget,
 Making me feel while yearning to each shrine,
 Although they spake not, that their homes were mine !
 Farewell, the holiest twilight ! beauty spread
 Over her bosom that reflection told
 Of Eden beneath that ethereal fold
 Hidden, of roses in their fragrance shed.
 Farewell, my once loved flowers ! companions given,
 Blending their life with mine, that I have felt
 Were living things, that sympathies in them dwelt
 With mine, remembrances from parted Heaven,
 For in bright sunshine I have seen them glad,
 As if my joy they had ;
 Drooping their heads, beneath the sky o’ercast,
 With a felt sorrow : they too die, like me,

philosophy of either; nor does it seem to throw much further light on the mysterious consequences of the fall, or put before us in new colours the condition of the mind of Cain. The death of Abel precedes the opening of the poem; Cain has set his face to go to the land of Nod; but otherwise the scenes are much in the same order as in the drama of Lord Byron, although the plan is more elaborated. There are likewise many resemblances of thought, and even of expression. Lucifer appears to Cain, and learns how far he is prepared to oppose an indomitable will to all that may fall to his lot; and bears him into the abyss of the earth, and then into the void of space, showing him the ghosts or phantoms of worlds already wrecked, of beings existing on this earth's surface before man's creation, and also the history of things to come. After which follows a scene which is almost the only portion of the drama which does not in some measure resemble 'Cain:' this is 'the Paradise of Heilel,' the abode of a being, as she is described, of all sweetness, and gentleness, and love, but in whose heart there is a void, yearning for the love of some one with whom she might share her whole thoughts. Cain is brought before her, and she instantly hails him as the realization of all her longings, and for awhile they dwell in harmony, but presently the darkness and obstinacy of Cain reveals itself, and the love of Heilel, not meeting with entire communion of thought on his part, receives a fatal wound; thus showing, it may be concluded, that even a paradise will be no paradise to him who is given over to the moody waywardness of a fretful and ungoverned mind. Cain is then borne back to earth. Ada has already died; and after he has visited her grave, he receives a mortal wound from the arrow of his son Enoch, whom he had unwittingly startled. This fact itself seems a contradiction to the implied meaning at least of Holy Writ; as also does the mention of a child of Abel. (P. 12.) But, apart from isolated facts such as these, the whole tenor of this drama, as of 'The Deluge,' seems at variance with the mind of these the earliest of the human race, and anticipates a condition of intellect and thought not realized until long afterwards. We can scarcely imagine that the condition of the world, and of man, was sifted by Cain with that subtle analysis which we find in these pages; or that the one prevailing absorbing desire was for more knowledge, intellectual, moral, physical,—a yearning to pry into things invisible as well as visible. Undoubtedly, in Cain there was no submission, no obedience; much of moodiness and jealousy, with an inflexible and indomitable obstinacy; but it seems in the strictest analogy to be probable that the characters of those early times were simple and easily : per for good or for evil: it

character by whom the words are supposed to be uttered. At the same time, if, in such pieces, wicked men only are introduced, it should be in such sort that the reader shall clearly see the wickedness throughout, and perceive, moreover, the writer's judgment regarding it. We can perceive no more here than that Malefort is represented as the victim of his own inveterate habits of mind, which bring misery to those whom he ought most to love, but against which he does not struggle, as being unconquerable, and vainly murmuring because he fails of reaching the heights of a long-cherished ambition, while the Stranger recommends the practice of philanthropy and the 'erasing of the taint of self-love;' but this amidst such a mass of conflicting opinions and directions, that (although we have no predilections for such subjects) we feel it our duty to give the mere statements made on both sides, to show of what ill-assorted materials an ethical poem may be composed.

'Scepticism'—so it is put in the mouth of Malefort—

'Is on our own weak natures grafted
Toward God as man;' (294)

and—

'The sense of failure
Makes the will impotent: we feed life's lamp
From habit hopelessly.'—289.

Habitual reserve and coldness wearies out the affection of his wife; she dies in broken-hearted sorrow. The memory of past life possibly at the last suggesting that he was unworthy to lie by Lillian, he adds—

'If we be separate everlastingly,
So be our dust.'—343.

The guilt of some sin is heavy upon his soul, some act of violence, if not of murder, in 'wild passion' (298) and 'with wild hand' (329) committed; yet repentance is no long task; he has made no effort to conquer long fixed habits; still he draws the chief argument for the immortality of his soul from—

'Knowledge and repentance of its guilt;' (341)

and he beholds at last the form of his wife—

'Forgiveness in her eyes,
Recorded pardon from atonement won.'—346.

But he finds comfort also elsewhere:—

'I talk to air,
Yet we feel heard, or wherefore turn to Nature?
I drew from thee peace, if not hope; none look
On thee and feel despair: a calm is stamp'd
Upon thy brow, that looks tranquillity;' (330.)

Again and again the world of men is held up to bitter scorn,
for—

‘Each man conceals behind material veils
Thoughts or intents abhorred, if reveal’d;
In every breast dwells selfishness, rooting
All motive, blossoming in good or ill.’—333.

Remorse, therefore, is but a relative term, because

‘Man’s estimation of deeds colours them.
Where the sun scorches, passion is a virtue,—
Where cold contracts, a vice’—(334);

and rightly then may he,—

‘Scorn this imperfect thing,
This medley of contradictions, man: sensual all,
And hypocrites, save to the All-seeing one.’—343.

Yet remorse is what all ought to feel.

‘Nor should’st thou pass
Death’s gate, till thou hast cleansed thy heart of guilt,
Of thoughts or deeds oppressing thee.’—540.

His own faith he terms a noble one,—

‘Thou makest God a tyrant, bowing to
Thy image set up, or with doubt or fear;
Thou typest Him, thyself a thing of passion:
I, as the sun, His emblem set in heaven,
All light, love, glory, and beneficence.’—342.

But withal, to a previous question from Malefort,

‘What hast thou faith in?’

he replies,—

‘Nothing: I demanded
An infinite of time to know myself;
A moment is accorded, I am silent.’—304.

And again, when he asks, pointing to the body of his wife,—

‘Darest thou deny that an immortal essence
Dwelt in that mortal temple?’

his answer is,—

‘I believe,
Hope, gainsay nothing; if it dwelt therein,
Or whence it came, or whether fled to heaven
Or air; it lies beyond me: I grope through
Life’s labyrinth of mysteries as then,
The veil of central Isis still unraised.’—322.

These various views (whatever else they may be) are not very consistent; and the clearness is not heightened, when the stranger calls himself Malefort’s ‘visible conscience,’ a phrase which by itself might have been clear, but he is also present with Malefort in his dreams, becoming here rather a quality than an embodiment of flesh and blood. This mixture of the allegorical is perplexing in the description of a character

last time, when faith shall scarcely be found, many falling away, and the love of many others waxing cold. But this dream of human perfectibility has its birth in the idea that no real essential change came over the soul of man at the fall; hence the whole cycle of truths ranging round the one truth of the Incarnation, is either most feebly and partially grasped or wholly ignored: and this false theory as to the present natural condition of man becomes the key-note to the whole philosophy. Hence follows no higher appreciation of the mediatorial office than such a collocation as the following:—

' So felt the wisest of the antique world,
Solon thus,
And he whose name was wisdom's, Socrates.
And thou with reverence named, who call'dst thyself
The Son of Man, on thy redeeming mission,
Didst teach us active duties, peace, and love,
Bade wisdom learn the knowledge of herself,
To sit at home with children round her knees.'—ii. 309.

Most partial and inadequate as this is, we may not shrink from saying how entirely uncertain and erroneous the whole teaching becomes when taken together with the following words spoken by Noah, the prophet of God :—

'God walks no more with man alone
In Eden, yet doth watch his own.
Yea, one shall emanate from Him,
Transmuted Godhead, who shall make
Archangel's glories on his right hand dim.
He shall teach man his spirit's heavenly lot,
By sin, and doubt, and pride forgot,
Till he shall earthly creeds forsake
For truth.'—Vol. i. p. 149.

Man, then, has but forgotten his real condition: it is only needed that his memory should be roused by teaching, to bring him back to all his forfeited happiness and virtue. Every fact and every doctrine of the Mediation, of our reunion with God through the incarnation of His Son, of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the recreated members of Christ's body—everything, in short, which makes the faith of Christ to be in any wise different from or better than the systems of any earthly philosopher, are by one sweeping blow thrown down and thrust aside. The rock, steadfast and sure, is abandoned; and the house which must now be raised can be built only on the shifting sand, rocking before each driving wind. We must look to meet with inconsistencies, and contradictions, and vagueness of view, and we shall not fail of finding them. Whether the mind relies solely on itself, or the soul places her trust on all which God has given to guide her, the one want must still

' I stood the worms and dead among,
And yet I felt a living soul
Within me, scorning the control
Of Fate it must obey.'—i. 351.

' I feel in me the spark divine
Of life was lighted, Lord, from thine.'—i. 354.

' I,
Within this body's cell immured,
Look'd out into infinity,
Till, gazing on its face, I felt
The Infinite within me dwelt.'—i. 357.

The other is answered on more equivocal authority,—

' Ambition beckon'd to the sky,
And told me I was great;
That there shone immortality,
A purer, loftier state;
That I should flee from star to star
In infinite progression, join'd
With things that everlasting are
By God enshrined,'—(i. 352,)

from star to star—

' Where onward they innumerable roll
Through space, the thunder music of the spheres.
Each atom portion of the living soul
Of the vast heart that vibrates through the whole'—(ii. 110);

being then, as now,

' A part of the eternal soul that glows
In all things which through life, death, motion dwells,
Whose pulse each blade of grass each world revolving tells.'—ii. 111.

Much as this would seem to deny individual responsibility, there are other passages which assert it; but on this point, as on the subject of repentance, there are strange contradictions. Sometimes he speaks of pardon obtained upon repentance, at others he avows neither repentance nor regret on the retrospect of past life. We can but give them as they occur in two poems of great beauty and tenderness, very recently written in the scene of his boyhood, where

' Mendip's bleak and barren heights again enclosed me round,
Like faces of forgotten friends met on forgotten ground.'

And touching indeed is the picture drawn of old recollections :—

' The lark sprang from the turf again, and cleaved the air along,
Intoxicate with joy, he pour'd forth madly in his song:
The clouds on the blue sky reposed, and silently reveal'd
Their waiting aspect, and the calm on each vast forehead seal'd.
The thistle's beard flew past me, but, as once, I chased it not:
I stood where games were play'd whose very names I had forgot.
I saw the faces I had raised, I met each answering eye,
I heard their eager voices fill the halls of memory.

- ' Life is oblivion, hope its sigh suppress'd :
Let the great mystery in darkness rest,
So, childlike, I be gather'd to thy breast,
' Or in Thyself, or in the universe,
Thy visible thought : and be this final verse
Record of him whose spirit Thou didst nurse.'—ii. 407.

And is it so, then, that any, whether in the springtime of life, or when earthly toil is drawing to a close, can content himself with the thought that life is a great mystery ; and leave it to rest in darkness, not knowing whether his soul will preserve a distinct and conscious existence, or be absorbed into the general life that pervades the universe ? Life is indeed mysterious, but the veil has in part been raised, and they who will, may walk by the light shining in the dark places. The mists still loom before that world unseen, but they are broken ; and they whose feet are stayed upon the Rock, may enter into the cloud, with fear, indeed, but with hope and comfort still. Most inscrutable it is that the highest vigour of intellect and so great beauty of mind and disposition, should be permitted thus to wander ' in the wilderness out of the way : ' most wonderful that oftentimes they whose powers, mental and moral, appear most calculated to do great things for the cause of God, are yet found warring against Him : it is not so, happily, in this case ; but it is the spirit crying out to be led forth into the paths of truth, and yet refusing to be guided in the ways that are ordained. The desire may be for truth,—the heart may long to serve God and to attain to the knowledge of Him,—yet while wandering in a course self-chosen, we may fear that the words apply to us, ' He that gathereth not with me, scattereth.'

adduce analogies in order to prove, or even to discuss the reviving power that may exist in dormant life ; we have no occasion, in the matter now under our notice, to argue in this way, that there may be life in something now apparently dead ; but we have mentioned the quietness and ease of nature's reviving powers, only by way of illustration of what is already established as a fact in the parallel we would institute.

It seems but a short space, nay, but yesterday, since to talk of Convocation was the mark of archæological abstraction from all existing scenes, or of imprudent enthusiasm void of all practical wisdom and discretion. Convocation was seen to be dead, existing only in form, but without life ; and the form was therefore despised, as a cast-off garment which only chance had kept from being thrown altogether away. It is true that some things do linger on in a strange way, which yet are destined only to perish ; but there is a sort of presumption, that legal forms continually acted up to, and that at considerable trouble, without the smallest present advantage or apparent object, have some intrinsic meaning in them which one day will come out. And this is truly the case with Convocation. It went on, in form, through years of total obscurity to public interest, and now it is seen that the opportunity has arrived for it to awaken out of its sleep. Convocation is now a real, active power. Strange as it may seem, contrary as it may be to our wise prognostications, in direct opposition as it may be to all our notions of probability, or even possibility, we yet wake up from this oppression of the difficulties of the case, simply to behold Convocation quietly beginning to assume a natural place in our Constitution. All our fears and doubts as to its practicability were on the supposition that the whole structure had to be built up and established for the first time ; whereas the machine had not to be invented, experimented on, put together by degrees, and modestly suggested to the public, in opposition to all manner of prejudices and private interests, which assail any new device, whether a new reaping-machine or an ecclesiastical canon ; but it only required putting into motion, for the conquest of all preliminary difficulties, is a legacy which we derive from past times. In whatever way, therefore, differently-disposed people may hitherto have thought and talked of Convocation, one fact is now patent and declared to the world ; viz. that it really is a part of the external system in which we, of this land, now live. Some may have ignored its existence, in contempt or unconsciousness ; others may have thought of it only as an antiquarian subject of research ; others may hear the sound of the word with a dread of being bored to death by stupid discussions ; others may have formed uncomfortable alarms as to the prospect which it afforded of giving too great power of

being favourable to its active functions, will, in the absence of such as hold other views, constitute a majority that must constitutionally be listened to; or it implies that the opponents of Convocation must actually be present in numbers sufficient to outweigh the supporters of it. In this case there will, necessarily, be a large body of the Clergy met for actual debate, if only on the question of petitioning the Crown; and with this momentum we think the ultimate success of the cause to be safe. A contest, a hard-fought battle, whether lost or won, gives reality to any movement, which in the case of Convocation is felt to be the point most required, and of far more importance than the particular result of any one division. The opponents of Convocation will be in a manner defeated on every issue, both if they stay away and if they present themselves. Meanwhile, however, we leave it to them to choose their own tactics and count their own men, and ourselves proceed to the task of reviewing the almost unanimous expression of the whole parochial clergy, as shown in the recent election of Proctors, in favour of the active functions of Convocation.¹

The election of Proctors for Convocation has attracted so little interest now for many generations, that few persons are at all acquainted with the legal forms by which it is done. Yet these forms are of great importance as evidence of the law; they explain the presumed value of Convocation as part of our Constitution, and they impress upon the Clergy their individual responsibility in the duty of electing fit men to represent them in the arduous tasks which pertain to an ecclesiastical synod. Many clergymen have been powerfully struck, at the recent elections, with words, read in an official manner by the registrar, of which they had never been conscious as forming part of our country's law. Grievances had been felt by quiet and uncomplaining churchmen; inconsistencies of a painful kind, with reference to the Church and State question, had been impressed upon their minds as the result of parochial experience;—they had known that a remedy was wanted for evils, which long had been forced on their notice, and, without expressing their feelings in hacknied or vulgar language, they had still felt that the Church wanted a certain liberty, which active and living institutions must have if they are to be of real use;—they had witnessed the trial or attempted trial of many schemes for the government and regulation of Church affairs;—they had in turn

¹ So important and practical has the subject already become, that we have received the announcement of a Monthly Journal 'in which the progress of the present movement will be detailed, and all information on the subject collected.' The proposed periodical, of which the first number is to appear in November, will be styled 'Synodalia.' (Whitaker, Pall Mall.)

what we require to develop, and we ought to be most jealous of every detail that commits the State to the synodical action of the Church. The law is what we want, and must work on that tack with rigid perseverance. We must claim our pound of flesh; we must confront the powers that be with their own words, their bond, and promise. A little legal reiteration is not tiresome to those who feel the hold which their words give to the Church's advocates; the oftener some things are said the better, especially where people are dull of hearing, from the most potent of all reasons, that they won't hear.

We take for granted, where not expressly stated to the contrary, that the legal forms were read in all the recent elections. In the majority of reports it is distinctly said that they were, and we doubt whether it is not open to dispute the validity of an election not conducted in a formal manner. What is the nature of the meeting which elects the Proctors? It is not only a voluntary gathering together of so many Clergymen legally entitled to exercise the privilege of voting; but it is a Court; it is a Diocesan Synod, forming a Court for a particular purpose; it is commonly held in the Consistory Court, although its exact connexion with the other functions of that Court is a question not involved in our present subject. This Synod or Court is not to be compared with the use of the franchise in electing members of the civil parliament, for in that case the law does not order the use of the privilege, it only allows it. Whereas, the Clergy are cited in a formal manner, and pronounced contumacious if they do not appear; more after the style of summoning the grand jury at the opening of assizes. We observe that the terms 'Synod' and 'Court' were repeatedly used and in no case contradicted;—the Bishop of Oxford using the former word himself as an authoritative definition of the assembly. The form announcing the election in the words 'I pronounce so and so to be elected,' implies also that it is the judgment of a legal court.

In one instance, however, we have to notice rather a significant passing over of the formal part of the proceedings. Archdeacon Wigram, at Winchester, was so tender of wasting the time of his clergy, and so regardful of their convenience, that in the first place he avoided the Consistory Court, where such proceedings had usually been conducted; and in the next place, for the purpose of saving time, he proposed simply to read his Lordship's letter to himself, instead of following it up by a recital of the technical forms by which it was accompanied. Of the change of place we are able not to judge, not knowing the respective convenience of the Consistory Court in Winchester Cathedral, and the south aisle of the chancel; but, unless such adjournment

the clergy to come before his successor. In the province of York her haste, in accordance with legal precedent, is so great, that she will not risk any confusion among the Clergy, or any running away from their arduous duties of deliberation, by suffering Convocation to be without a President, even till the new Archbishop is appointed. At the death, therefore, of the late Archbishop of York, she forthwith wrote to the dean and chapter of the cathedral, commanding them to elect a President. This writ was signed 'by the Queen herself,' with her own hand.

With due thanks to the Queen for her concern on behalf of Convocation, and with the assurance to her advisers that the Church will bear in mind the importance which this official anxiety implies must be attached in our Constitution to her synodical action, we pass on to the next stage, viz.—what the Archbishop of Canterbury does when he has received these royal commands. He transmits them to the Bishop of London as Dean of the province of Canterbury, requiring him in that capacity to 'cite' all the bishops of the province, and through them all deans, archdeacons personally, chapters by one proctor, and the clergy by two. This is 'to treat of arduous and weighty affairs, which shall concern the state and welfare, public good and defence of this kingdom, and the subjects thereof, to be then and there seriously laid before them, and to give them their good counsel and assistance in the said affairs, and to consent to such things as shall happen to be wholesomely ordered and appointed by this common advisement for the honour of God and the good of the Church.' He further orders Charles James, Bishop of London, to intimate to all these suffragans and others, that they will not be excused from 'appearing in this affair of Convocation,' unless for some necessary cause alleged and approved, otherwise their contumacy will be canonically punished. Instigated by this authoritative command the Bishop of London then peremptorily admonishes all the suffragan bishops to cite the deans, archdeacons, &c., and the clergy of their dioceses to appear before the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop of York does not act through a dean of the province, but communicates directly to the bishops, and the words actually used by him at the election of proctors in 1847, contrast oddly with the reception that met some few clergy, who were either simple enough to act on these solemn commands, or from various motives thought fit to present themselves as members of Convocation. After citing the deans, &c., and proctors of archdeacons to appear to give their wholesome advice, and 'to do and receive what the nature of this provincial Convocation shall demand and require,' he concludes,—'And we also intimate to you, and by you to the said dean and

some few topics of doubt or complaint, which have arisen out of the actual proceedings, just concluded, in the election of Proctors. Having done this, we shall give a general summary of the election, that will show how great a victory the advocates of Convocation have gained, although all the difficulties were undeniably against, rather than in favour of their cause.

In the first place, a habit had naturally grown up, during the indifference attached to the whole subject, of giving very insufficient notice to the Clergy, as to the time and place for the election of Proctors. This grievance was loudly expressed beforehand, and in many places requisitions or private communications were forwarded to those in authority, requesting that due notice might be given. The custom had often been, for an advertisement to be put in the county paper, on the Saturday, perhaps, announcing the election of a Proctor on the Monday morning; or notice was put on one church door, just at the time when all the Clergy would necessarily be in their respective churches and parishes. In most cases, this wish was responded to with a good grace, as not only a fair and just desire, but a legal right. Letters were in most cases sent to each Clergyman who ought to be present, and in the diocese of Oxford an acknowledgment of its receipt was requested. We need not discuss here, what is the peculiar province of the Apparitor, as to whether the post-office is a legal method of serving a writ or citation, but it is important that the notice must be looked on as obligatory, and not only as an announcement which, in the eye of the law, may be responded to or not, at the will of the recipient. There is a legal penalty attached to the contempt of it, which proves the formal and synodical character of the assembly thereby summoned, and which therefore must not be overlooked. In the precedents before us, eight days is the time given between the citation and the election; and it ought not to be less than that, considering the distance that many have to come. In some cases, however, the snug system was persevered in, even during the late election, and complaints were uttered at the election itself, of the wretched sort of notice which had been given. In the Archdeaconry of Stafford it was stated at the election that no notice had been given, but by an advertisement in the paper, which was not felt to be enough. In the Archdeaconry of Wells, the only notice given, was through a paper put on the door of the Archdeacon's own church, which was a great violation even of courtesy, if we bear in mind how many of that Archdeaconry would be well known as anxious to attend.

The question next arises as to who are to be cited, that is, who have a right to vote in the election? This was a fruitful

this *general* expression stops here, for it is interpreted in the further writs, even that of the Archbishop to his own Archdeacons, as 'elective Rectors and others, having and possessing Ecclesiastical Benefices and Promotions.' In the province of York, the expression, 'the whole Clergy,' is retained in the Archbishop's mandate to the Bishops, while in the writs to Archdeacons there is added, 'and all and singular others who anciently used to be called, cited, and admonished.'

In the province of York, therefore, the curates' claim stands on a better footing; and the Archdeacon of the East Riding did not hesitate to receive them. In the province of Canterbury it may fairly be asked, By what right was the larger expression converted into the more defined one, at what period was it done, and what precedent is there for it? If that precedent goes very far back, it would be useless to deny its legality, however we might appeal to the original words, in arguing a reform; the legality of it must, therefore, at present rest on length of custom, which, in one case often quoted, was said to date as far back as the year 1588. But another question may fairly be asked,—May not the same authority which received the incumbents of district churches, though not legally beneficed clergymen, also receive licensed curates? If the one was legal, why not the other? The ancient precedents, if they are in favour only of beneficed clergymen, could not be extended to the incumbents of district churches by any construction which would not equally apply to curates; for districts were not in existence when those precedents were established, and therefore, no peculiar provision could be made for them: nor do we imagine that precedents of only a recent date are binding, as such, one way or the other. On the supposition, then, that the relaxation of the words 'beneficed clergy,' legally includes district churches, we claim also for curates. The pecuniary distinction, however, of a freehold, which perpetual curacies are, remains.

The only diocese of the province of Canterbury where curates' votes were taken in the recent election, was that of Hereford; which was stated to be on the ground that they had been so taken at former elections. Claims were made, and protests entered in very many instances, as in the archdeaconry of Middlesex, at Bristol, Bangor, Rochester, Peterborough, Dorchester, S. Asaph. The diocese of Manchester is the only one in the province of York, where curates are stated definitely (according to the reports before us) to have had their claims refused. At Durham and Carlisle it is said, that several curates were present; but, as the elections were unanimous, their right of voting was not tested. We think it the greater pity that the Bishop of Manchester should have refused them, as he started proceedings, by

occurred since the general alteration, Essex had continued to vote with London, though, when adverting to the present diocese of Rochester, we shall see that such is not the case this time. Another rather questionable mode of election in a diocese, which is yet very generally adopted, is dividing the whole diocese into two parts, apportioning one Proctor to each division. The legal mandates all require two Proctors to be chosen by the diocese, in the same manner that two members of Parliament are to be returned by a county. Each voter has then a voice in two candidates, whereas by an arbitrary apportioning of a single representative to his own peculiar district this double interest is destroyed. We are not sufficiently prepared with the history of the modes of election in each diocese, so as to judge of the amount of authority there may be for this proceeding, or the length of time there may be to establish this custom in certain dioceses; but considering how very probable it is, that, during the small interest taken in the whole question for several generations, many lax and irregular modes of conducting business have crept in, it is wise for the Clergy to be upon their guard against any customs which interfere with their rights. They need not take for granted that arrangements of this kind have ancient authority, seeing how great a probability there is that they have been mere recent expedients to save trouble, without any idea that the individual rights of the Clergy were at all thought of.

In some cases the division is not equal. The diocese of Norwich is thus divided, and the two archdeaconries of Norfolk send one, while the single archdeaconry of part of Suffolk sends the other. A Norfolk clergyman has thus a less share in the selection of a Proctor than is legally awarded to him, as living in the diocese. It is difficult to account for the variety of custom in different dioceses. Sometimes this may arise from local distinctions, that are older than the modelling of Convocation by Edward I., and which may have been suffered to remain, where not interfering with the general province of Convocation. There is no reason why each diocese should return its Proctors exactly in the same manner, and where ancient custom has established a certain mode of proceeding, it would be unnecessary to violate it, for the sake of a mere paper uniformity; but on the other hand there is no reason why a habit that results only from a period of indifference, should meet with any respect. There is one decided objection to this mode; which is, that the influence of the Bishop, or private interest of any kind, may vary in different parts of a diocese, and therefore Proctors may be returned without that general balance of opposite parties and impartial interests, which space will give. This mode of proceeding was, in the recent election, adopted in only four dioceses of the

politics, for an incumbent who was not then actually represented, to be informed, that in due course of our septennial Parliaments, the living he then filled would come to its turn of being represented. We believe, however, that on the present occasion, eight elected by the Archdeaonries did themselves choose the two who were to represent them. The same complaints were forcibly made by the Clergy of the Archdeaonry of Wilts, and, as the event proved, not without good reason, for neither of their nominees were finally chosen, the lot falling on the two elected by the Archdeaonry of Sarum, Mr. Caswell, and Mr. Lowther; most excellent and fit men indeed, but for that reason men who would be first to object to the mode of their own election. Here again we believe the final selection to have been made by the whole six, which is a very much less abuse than the custom in the diocese of Rochester, which we next consider. This diocese consists of four archdeaonries, who return eight Proctors, from whom the Bishop of Rochester selects two. The popular element ceases, therefore, altogether with the first election, and the further choice has not the pretence of being simply an intermediate step for the sake of convenience. In that diocese the parochial clergy are represented in almost an infinitesimal proportion, if we go through all the members of Convocation which proceed from it. The bishop, the dean, by some strange accident two chapters' proctors, and four archdeacons, making altogether seven, are on the one side, while even the two whom the parochial clergy select, are chosen by the bishop out of eight. The parochial clergy, therefore, may return three-fourths of its Proctors of one way of thinking, and yet, at the arbitrary will of the bishop, they may be represented entirely by Proctors of another way of thinking. Nor can we always trust to the good taste of our bishops, to avoid so glaring an outrage on the feelings of their clergy, when the power is before them of advancing their own side of the question. We have mentioned eight dioceses in the province of Canterbury, in which there seem to be irregularities in the fair and direct representation of the parochial clergy. In the remaining thirteen, the whole diocese joined in the general election of two representatives, who were thereby pronounced actual members of Convocation. In these cases the proceedings on the whole were of a much more satisfactory and agreeable nature. There was less complaint, and the synodical element of the Church was more realized in the minds of those who were present, as witness the election at Oxford. Vexatious dictation, as at Stafford, did not advance its own cause, but only provoked an inharmonious character in the proceedings; while in Oxford, the diocesan idea prevailed in establishing universal good feeling, though some points in the management of the business were strictly and justly canvassed.

cleric who votes, and not the holder of a benefice; and in the next place, it proves an injustice from the entire loss of a vote, if the curate, where the rector is non-resident, cannot represent the clerical rights in this respect. There is a peculiar custom in most of the citations to name two hours, between which the election must take place; and when this was the case it was decided that a candidate might be proposed at any time within those hours, and consequently that the election could not be declared before the whole time was expired, however soon the business was really concluded. Any clergyman coming in before the time was up was held to clear himself of his contumacy, though a Proctor might be elected, who was absent.

It was suggested by a clergyman in the archdeaconry of London, that any clerk might be elected Proctor without belonging himself to the diocese which he would represent; and if there is any analogy between civil and ecclesiastical parliaments this must certainly be the case. Questions were in several places asked as to whether the Proctors could receive petitions on the occasion of their election, in order that they might present them before Convocation. This was generally refused, and we think justly; for, if allowed, the meetings would have departed from their strict legal character of being a Court or Synod convened for a special purpose, namely, to elect Proctors, and would have merged, dangerously perhaps in the present state of things, into too irregular an assembly. Moreover, we do not see any motive for wishing it, except the mere convenience of a certain number of Clergy being together, which could be easily taken advantage of by announcing another meeting of a voluntary description to come after the formal act, and at which a petition could be drawn up and given to the Proctor. This was actually done in the archdeaconry of Lindisfarne, in the diocese of Durham. Where, however, the Archdeacon himself, as President of the Synod, thinks fit to receive a memorial to the Queen, and himself signs it, as was the case at Durham, we must hold that to be legal, and within the province of the Synod, in the same way that it was successfully claimed by the Bishop of Exeter, at the last meeting of Convocation, on the obvious ground of necessity, that a synod may deliberate to petition for the royal licence, without being amenable to the law which forbids, not the transaction of business, but the passing of Canons.

The place of meeting varies much, but the consistory court is most proper, any other being either a substitute for it, and so far made to be one for the time, or an adjournment from it. The Bishop of Manchester, we think very improperly, selected the chancel of the Church, himself sitting on the north of the altar, a proceeding which cannot have been necessary or seemly.

that any elector might offer remarks on the subject; and, considering the essential equality of all voters, as being cited to exercise a certain synodical power, we cannot imagine on what ground any other conclusion could be arrived at. The actual power of the whole affair rests with the assembled Clergy who have votes. They are cited to elect Proctors as part of a system of popular representation, and, subject to certain legal conditions of relevancy to a given end, they may do what they like, and talk among themselves as they like: indeed, it is quite optional whether they adopt the ordinary conventional practices of public meetings or not—those practices, we mean, which simply facilitate business without being in their nature essential, as that no one shall speak except according to a certain program. In a public meeting, the committee, who calls it, is the acting power for the time being; and they, as having possession of the room, may prohibit any one from speaking but whom they invite; but in Synod the whole meeting are in the place of such committee, or of a jury in a court of justice; for all have an absolute right to be present, and are not there on sufferance.

The same permission was granted by the Archdeacon of Craven, and tacitly allowed by the Bishop of Norwich; but there were several important occasions on which it was absolutely refused, which we must also notice. The most prominent cases, for we pass over several, where speakers were stopped, on the ground of diverging from the subject, are the meetings at Oxford, Devizes, and Manchester. We regret that the Bishop of Oxford was so imperative on this subject, as his dictum was adduced in subsequent elections, and had influence as coming from him. Moreover, it was inconsistent with his own claim that the meeting was a Synod, for himself, as Bishop, to speak, and for the priests to be silent. At Devizes the Archdeacon also checked questioning with summary authority, in spite of a very general feeling among all present that they had a right to ask the candidate certain questions. 'The Guardian' appends the following judicious remarks on the subject to its report of the meeting:—

'The decision of the Archdeacon, although agreeing with the course taken by the Bishop of Oxford, is palpably mistaken; for the archiepiscopal mandate is, that the Clergy choose *fit* and *proper* Proctors; and the very notion of choosing implies certainly the liberty of examining, and, as the Clergy cannot possibly ascertain who will be nominated before the actual business is before them, it follows that they have full liberty to examine the views of those nominated, and to put questions to them. The power of examining is *necessary* to the due fulfilment of the duty laid before them. To perform high and solemn duties carelessly, and as a mere matter of form, is a grave moral offence.'

The Bishop of Manchester, also, took the line of the proceedings being purely ministerial, and that therefore discussion was

calculation. Before the question was really put and tried, their influence was supposed to be in favour of the opponents, simply because there was this common ground between them, that both desired to do nothing. Now, however, that something is actually being done, the neutral, who still do nothing, leave the vigorous opponents in their true nakedness. There is also an unwillingness in all opponents of Convocation, to encourage a contest on the subject, from the consciousness that a struggle will necessarily bring the question into dangerous familiarity with the public mind; in fact, they see, as we have stated before, that a fight about it is in itself a great step in advance, even if the cause should meet with a temporary defeat. In many dioceses there were attempts at opposition, which never came to light for this very reason, as well as on general grounds of the small probability of success.

That our readers may judge of the great unanimity which has been shown by the parochial clergy in favour of Convocation, we will lay before them the general abstract, given by the 'John Bull' newspaper, of the Elections. This journal has done good service to the cause, by a certain vigour with which it treats any subject that it takes in hand; but we cannot altogether repress our regret at the very intolerant and illiberal spirit in which other religious questions are dealt with. We regret this, not on abstract grounds of alarm, that the virulence, and almost amusingly rabid, vituperation of other religious bodies, should seriously check the consistent working out of the principle of toleration, which as we have adopted, we must retain; but we regret to see the cause of Convocation in the hands of such advocates. As a matter of policy, we prefer that the claimants of our Church's freedom should not themselves be the bigoted invokers of the arm of the law against the synodical conclaves and edicts of another church, however bad we may think the taste of that church may be in forcing itself upon public notice as Rome has lately done.

The general summary which this paper gives of the Election will suffice for our present purpose, though the carefully collected table of the whole list of new Proctors is a valuable memorandum to keep at hand. We also commend the comments which are made after the complete list, as an introduction to the summary.

'This table is not yet as complete as we could wish. One of the absurdities which the officials endeavour to perpetuate is the secrecy observed respecting the names of the Proctors. Nothing can be more ridiculous than that a matter of public concern, such as the election of persons to serve in a public assembly, should be made a matter of mystery and concealment. Of right there ought to be an official publication of the members composing the new Convocation, and at all events no difficulties ought to

be thrown in the way of those who are endeavouring to supply the public with authentic information. We shall still be glad to receive from any one able to furnish it, such information respecting the names which are missing in the above table, and respecting their views on the revival of Convocation, as may enable us to make the list complete in every respect. In the meantime we may now commence summing up the results, as far as the Proctors for the parochial Clergy are concerned.

' In the Province of Canterbury there appear to be—

Members of Convocation favourable to the revival	35
Unfavourable	5
Neutral or unknown	2
	42

' This shows a majority in favour of the revival of seven to one; but this majority is still more decided, on reckoning up all the Proctors elected. Taking into account those whose election indicates the feeling of the electors, though they have no seats in Convocation, we arrive at the following results:—

Members of Convocation favourable as above .	35
Proctors elected, but who will not sit, favourable to the revival	15
Total of returns favourable to the revival . .	50

' On the other side one only has to be added to the number of those who are unfavourable, and the numbers therefore are, 50 favourable, and 6 unfavourable, which is in the proportion of more than 8 to 1.

' In the Province of York we have—

Members of Convocation favourable to the revival	15
Proctors to be selected from the three Archdeaconries of the diocese of Durham, all favourable	3
	18

' Against these eighteen, who are decidedly favourable, the entire Province produces only one that is neutral, neither an advocate for the revival, nor a violent opponent. Taking into account all the returns, we have—

Members of Convocation favourable, as above .	18
Proctors who will not sit, for the Diocese of Durham, all favourable	3
One of the Proctors in the double return for the Archdeaconry of Richmond	1
Total favourable	22

' Against these twenty-two favourable, there is in the whole Province of York but one neutral, as before stated, and one decidedly unfavourable, being the opposition candidate for the Archdeaconry of Richmond.'

This summary may or may not be exact, therefore we also give a more general one from a leading article of the 'Morning Chronicle':—

' Our contemporaries have been for some time busily attempting to decide the question what proportion of the Lower House is in favour of synodical action. We believe that all such attempts are premature, or, at best, that they can be but very rough approximations to the fact. Nevertheless, as we shall probably be expected to follow the example of our neighbours, we will state at once our own opinion, and its grounds. We

shall embrace the Convocations of both provinces in one view. Their present constitution is as follows—twenty-nine deans, seventy-one archdeacons, thirty-one capitular, and sixty-six parochial Proctors. Now, among the parochial Proctors, who alone fairly represent the unrestricted and unbiassed mind of English Churchmen, the majority in favour of synodical action is perfectly overwhelming. About fifty we know to be pledged to its cause; and we are fully justified in assuming that half of the remaining sixteen are also its friends. Of the deans and capitular Proctors—who, as being appointed by the same kind of influence, may be classed together—we shall only claim one-fourth, which will add fifteen to our numbers. Of the archdeacons—who are, generally speaking, a very different set of men—the best judgment which we are able to form induces us to set down a third, or twenty-four, as advocates of Church action. Thus, out of the 197 members of whom the Convocation consists, we reckon that ninety-seven are in favour of its efficiency; and this number—paradox though it may seem—is amply sufficient for a good working majority. For it must be remembered that the hundred whom we assume to be on the opposite side include all the dead weight of the Church. A large proportion of these gentlemen might, indeed, if they were present, oppose free action; but they will certainly not take the trouble of travelling one or two hundred miles to ensure inaction. A large proportion also hold their present tenets simply because they believe them to be those of the majority. Deducting both these classes, we shall find very few, indeed, who are determined and active opponents of synodical freedom; and the *primâ facie* hundred antagonists will have dwindled into a very small and miserable minority.'

It now remains for us to notice a few of the principal contests, with such circumstances that occurred as may give interest or value to them. First, we shall take the favourable ones, which will occupy but small space, for the simple fact that such and such men are returned, who will advocate the cause of Convocation, is the main point. The preponderance of new members is, however, an important fact, thus commented on by 'The Morning Chronicle':—

'In the list of Convocation which we published on Wednesday, one of the most remarkable features is the extraordinary preponderance, among the parochial Proctors, of new names. In the province of Canterbury, only sixteen old members out of forty-two have been returned; and in that of York, only eight out of twenty-four. It is very encouraging to find that a large proportion of the new representatives are known as men of mark and talent—men not allied to this party or to that, but, in their various ways, zealous and energetic for the efficiency of the Church. In fact, the present Convocation is emphatically a working one. It will cut out work for itself, and do it, too, if it be allowed; and if not, it will cut out plenty of work for those who repress its energies. If it be the serious intention of the Premier to suppress the Ecclesiastical Parliament of 1852, we do not at all envy his feelings on contrasting the stuff of which this assembly is composed with that of previous Synods—with men who, scarcely knowing whether they were Proctors or not, contented themselves with periodically reading that such of their brethren as happened to be in town had voted a sleepy address to the Crown, and had been prorogued.'

The diocese of Canterbury is honoured by two favourable representatives, Mr. Chesshyre and Dr. Mill, between which last

interest, by a large majority, against the old Proctors, who neither had done nor would do anything in performance of their office.

No case is more illustrative of the popularity among the Clergy of the revival cause, than that of Manchester. There were 150 present; and in spite of the very prompt manner in which the episcopal arm was held up the very moment that any one dared to commence a free and reasonable discussion, it was generally understood that Mr. Darnford and Mr. Hornby were the popular men. The name of Stowell would indeed seem to be a formidable competitor when backed by the echoes of approbation resounding from Exeter Hall, and himself lately made honorary Canon by his bishop; an organized party, with Mr. Masters and Mr. Stowell to stand side by side, would be thought insuperable. It might also occur to some that as Mr. Stowell is so fond of declamation himself, and therefore must be of opinion that the Church may be greatly benefited by the art of public oratory, so of course he would be desirous of an open field for discussion in the Church's own machinery, and would be a strong advocate of Convocation. He could hardly, again, be thought to object on the often-mentioned plea that the parochial clergy had better keep to their own parishes, than trouble themselves about public affairs; but still it was felt that the traditions of Convocation did not exactly suit the Stowell party; and curiously enough, the Clergy of Manchester thought also that he would not suit Convocation; for the numbers were for Darnford and Hornby seventy-one and sixty-six, while Masters and Stowell recorded but forty and thirty-nine. Surely this was a strong hint to the Bishop, that his Clergy, even, though acting *ministerially*, had a will of their own, and were desirous, in general matters, of providing the Church with an expression of the Clergy's just influence.

We have now seen many instances of large assemblies of the Clergy, when acting without any overwhelming external bias, uniformly electing Proctors favourable to the revival of Convocation. But before we claim this as the universal issue of such popular contests, we must examine those which terminated unfavourably. Taking the 'John Bull's' list, we find only four cases in which actual elections (not dependent on a further choice) did so terminate. Without asserting that a decided advocacy of the cause was shown in all other instances, we shall yet confine our remarks to those four, as at any rate being the prominent non-revival cases, dwelling more peculiarly on one which is most to our purpose, because there was a large meeting, and the Clergy were fully alive to the whole affair. These four unsuccessful contests were at Winchester, Chichester, Lewes, and S. David's; which we shall consider in the reverse order of their importance.

of this election is so faithfully recorded in 'The Guardian' by a correspondent, that we give it in the words of that paper:—

'The election for a Proctor to represent the archdeaconry of Chichester took place on Tuesday, August 10, when the Rev. F. Vincent was declared duly elected by a majority of five. It is much to be regretted that in a matter affecting the welfare of the Church private feelings and matters wholly personal should be admitted. Mr. Vincent, though returned by an apparent majority, represents, in fact, the minority of the archdeaconry, his return having been effected by an unfortunate division on grounds exclusively personal in the ranks of his opponents. Mr. Goddard, who had represented the archdeaconry for fifteen years, had ceased to be resident in the diocese, and Mr. Vogan was put forward as a candidate upon the ground that it was fitting that the representative of the archdeaconry should be resident. Mr. Goddard and his friends considered themselves slighted by this, and, although the two candidates represented precisely the same principles, an eager canvass took place. Neither would yield, and though it was soon evident that Mr. Goddard must be in a great minority, his friends were determined to carry the election out at all risks; various plans of accommodation were attempted by the more judicious electors, but without success, and that which both parties must have considered alike—the interests of the Church—was sacrificed to private pique. The result of the election was—Vincent, 35; Vogan, 30; Goddard, 19. Although Mr. Vincent was supported principally by the Low Church party, the principle in question had but little to do with either High or Low Church. With respect to these matters, Mr. Vincent is a moderate man, and in many respects well calculated to represent the archdeaconry; but the principle which was really in question at that time was whether the immediate revival of Convocation was or was not necessary. The three candidates agreeing on other points, differed in this, that Mr. Vogan and Mr. Goddard alike were anxious for the full and free restoration of the Church's synodical action, while Mr. Vincent expressed himself thus:—"For my own part, I do not think that the Church would be a gainer by such a revival of Convocation, and, therefore, though I admit the abstract right or equity, which might be pleaded in its favour, I should be most unwilling, as at present advised, to urge the adoption of such a measure."

'The apparent sentiments of the archdeaconry, therefore, are not its real sentiments; for although the non-restoration candidate was returned by a majority of five, it is evident that had it not been for this most unfortunate and not very creditable squabble, either of the candidates on the opposite side of the question would have come in by a majority of twelve. We trust that the Clergy will see that nothing can injure the cause of Convocation so much as these personalities; for this reason we consider the speech of Mr. Fairles peculiarly reprehensible. From the courtesies which were reciprocated in the speeches of those who might be supposed to represent the high and low schools of divinity in the archdeaconry of Chichester we augur much good. There appears to be little or no animosity between them, and a good deal of mutual respect. This is as it should be, and we are glad to find that the Chancellor noticed it in his concluding speech.'

From this Archdeaconry, the circumstances of which thus speak for themselves, we turn to that of Lewes. In this case we acknowledge a fair contest, as far as we know of its circumstances, and can only regret that a majority of 19 were found to place credit in the *quieta non movere* argument, to use the words of the proposer of Mr. Grace. We do not, however, even

from liability to any such charge. Feeling how amply, indeed beyond all proportion, they themselves are represented, they ought to be more than content with their exceeding many flocks and herds, without coveting the poor man's one ewe lamb. In the case before us, however, we have to complain that such good taste and right feeling were altogether disregarded, and that corrupt influences, amounting to moral intimidation and bribery, were exerted to an offensive and audacious extent. The Bishop of Winchester, Archdeacon Wigram, and a certain clique of Incumbents, holding great rich livings, given them by the Bishop, would seem to have concocted the whole affair at Farnham Castle, and to have determined on entirely overwhelming any attempt at opposition. One rural deanery, that of Odiham, manfully and judiciously announced Mr. Trench as a candidate, for which they gained great credit, both for their selection and their spirit. But forthwith, this attempt at freedom of opinion was denounced as impertinent and fraught with danger, and a letter was sent to the local paper, which commenced by insulting this one independent rural deanery, and concluded by sounding an alarm that all the laity of the Church would be priest-ridden, if ever Convocation were suffered to meet. Copies of Archdeacon Sinclair's charge against Convocation were circulated round the diocese from Archdeacon Wigram, to mark the line he meant to take, contrary to the general etiquette, which restrains a judge from influencing his court by any privately expressed sentiments of his own. Archdeacon Wigram was about to act the part of returning officer in an election, and any attempt to canvass for a particular interest was an obvious impropriety. Canvassing of all kinds, however, went on under the direction of those whom we have named, and a document also appeared, which, with such illustrative comments as we shall find appropriate, and as the Clergy List supplies, will be interesting both with reference to our immediate object, and also as an abstract curiosity. This document is the manifesto of the Farnham synod; it is the work of his Lordship's faithful and obedient servants, the Clergy of his diocese, who enjoy, or who expect to enjoy, the sweets of Sumner patronage. It is valuable, if we estimate what it cost; and it is profound, if we adopt the principle, which seems to be laid down for the synodical action of our Church, that benefited Clergy alone can have any voice in it.

It may be well to remember that in the Bishop of Winchester's other Archdeaconry, that of Surrey, a Proctor was returned who was strongly in favour of the revival. From this we may gather that the Bishop's moral influence over the views of his Clergy was not coextensive with his diocese, but was of a partial nature. It happens, however, that not only his moral

- Henry Carey, Perpetual Curate of Aldershott.
William Carus, Vicar of Romsey, Canon of Winchester, and Rural Dean.
[Canoury in Bishop's gift, worth 760*l.*, Romsey Dean and Canon.]
Thomas Clarke, Vicar of Mitcheldever, and Rural Dean.
T. Clarke, jun., Incumbent of Woodmancott.¹
John Noble Coleman, Incumbent of S. Katherine's Church, Ventnor, I.W.
Adair Colpoys, Rector of Droxford. [In Bishop's gift, 744*l.*]
Thomas Cottle, Vicar of Shalfleet.
E. B. Creek, Incumbent of Swanmore. [In Bishop's gift, 125*l.*]
Anthony Crowdy, Rector of Winnall. [In Bishop's gift, 170*l.*]
Alexander R. C. Dallas, Rector of Wonston. [In Bishop's gift, 967*l.*]
R. Denny, Perpetual Curate of Shidfield. [In Bishop's gift, 100*l.*]
William M. Dudley, Vicar of Whitchurch, and Rector of Laverstoke.
[Whitchurch in Bishop's gift, 205*l.*]
William Stevens Dusautoy, Rector of Exton. [In Bishop's gift, 331*l.*]
Charles S. Fanshawe, Rector of All Saints, Southampton.
Gerald S. Fitzgerald, Incumbent of Christchurch, Portswood. [In gift of Rector of S. Mary's, Southampton, which Rectory is in Bishop's gift.]
Edward Frowd, Rector of Upper Clatford.
Maximilian Geneste, Incumbent of the Church of the Holy Trinity, West Cowes.
William Gibson, Rector of Fawley, and Rural Dean. [In Bishop's gift, 1,179*l.*]
Francis Osborne Gifford, Vicar of Hartley Wintney.
W. D. Harrison, Vicar of South Stoneham. [In the gift of Rector of S. Mary's, Southampton, which Rectory is in gift of Bishop, Stoneham, 500*l.*]
Thomas Goodwin Hatchard, Rector of Havant. [In Bishop's gift, 489*l.*]
James Williams Hatherell, Incumbent of St. James's, Westend. [Virtually in Bishop's gift, 150*l.*, as Christchurch and Stoneham.]
William V. Hennah, Incumbent of East Cowes.
W. N. Hooper, Minor Canon, and Precentor of Winchester Cathedral, and Incumbent of Littleton. [Littleton, Dean and Chapter, Winchester, therefore under Bishop.]
Henry Howell, Incumbent of S. Peter's, Curdridge. [In gift of Rector of B. Waltham, appointed by Bishop.]
F. H. Hutton, Vicar of Leckford.
Charles Jackson, Perpetual Curate of Bentley. [In gift of Archdeacon of Surrey, approved by Bishop, 106*l.*]
Philip Jacob, Rector of Crawley, Canon of Winchester, and Rural Dean. [In gift of Bishop, Crawley, 690*l.*; Canonry, 760*l.*; Bishop's Examining Chaplain.]
W. Jones, Rector of Morestead. [In gift of Bishop, 180*l.*]
T. C. Kemp, Vicar of Eastmeon. [In gift of Bishop, 903*l.*]
Anthony L. Lambert, Rector of Chilbolton, and Rural Dean. [In gift of Bishop, 430*l.*]
John Law, Rector of Elvetham.
E. McAll, Rector of Brighstone, and Rural Dean. [In gift of Bishop, 515*l.*]
T. M. Macdonogh, Incumbent of Bransgore.
Wyndham C. Madden, Vicar of Fareham. [In gift of Bishop, 530*l.*]
Samuel Maddock, Vicar of Bishop Sutton.
John Pierce Maurice, Rector of Michelmersh. [In gift of Bishop, 671*l.*]
John Powlett McGhie, Vicar of Portsmouth, and Rural Dean.
Frederick Græme Middleton, Perpetual Curate of Medsted. [In gift of Bishop, 580*l.*]

been a melancholy sight to witness the imbecility of mind and body which was gathered together at Winchester, that it might quash, if possible, the young and vigorous action by which the Church is striving to meet the demands laid upon it. Old clergymen, who had not made their appearance in public for a long time, or who were even so infirm that they were unable to attend the services of the Church when at home, were dragged up to perform this sad and ungracious task of endeavouring to perpetuate a state of helplessness and indolence in the Church, of which they themselves had been, in many cases, too prominent examples. Several who saw all this refused to vote at all, having come for Mr. Haygarth. Yet, in spite of all influence from patronage, and in spite, also, of the systematic control exercised over the Rural Deans, and the abuse poured upon an unhappy individual of them who may express an independent opinion, and in spite of the risk incurred by many of forfeiting the hospitality and general good graces of Farnham Castle, we are glad to have it in our power to congratulate the Archdeaconry, that so many free and independent votes were recorded in favour of Mr. Trench.

Having now reviewed the elections individually, so far at least as is essential to our present purpose, we would invite attention to some general motives, which would seem of late to have guided the minds of the parochial clergy and influenced their votes. The question of High and Low Church has been much brought in, the former as being in favour of the Church's synodical action, and the latter against it. On the whole this has been the real state of the case; but there are many exceptions. Some honest and sincere members of the Low Church party have expressed their willingness to appeal to Convocation as the popular voice of the Church, and therefore as a fit tribunal before which certain differences should be settled; but generally speaking, that party betray the greatest dislike at anything like a fair representative system in the Church. The most energetic motive, however, of the present revival, springs from a wider basis than any one of the many party questions which have been agitating our Church. It is the natural love of harmony and concord, which seeks for some powerful centre on which confidence can be bestowed. The very agitation which has lately been witnessed in the election of Proctors, instead of aggravating the divisions of the Church, has brought together many smaller shades of opinion to act in concert, which of late have been painfully and unnecessarily estranged from each other. It is altogether a false argument, which so many adopt, that Convocation will create party spirit of a more dangerous character than exists where no power of self-regulation. It is the smaller suspicions

ner; they are accustomed to take a prominent position in all public affairs, and are not found behind others in the power of judging about disputed questions, as, for instance, when called on to act as magistrates; and why therefore are they to be set down as so utterly unqualified for public deliberation about religion, as that it is far better to leave all such things even in the hands of that promiscuous body of many and no religions, the House of Commons?

To return, however, to the point we were discussing, viz. the general feeling among the Clergy in favour of some power whereon to place confidence, and to which they may look for the fair discussion and decision of matters that are of interest to them. It may be asked by some few, Why not trust to the good sense and justice of the civil power, with the Queen as head of the Church, with the Bishops in the House of Lords, with the presumed acknowledgment of the Christian religion, still binding on the House of Commons, and with all the courts of law, to legislate and arbitrate in all ecclesiastical matters? This may be asked: but it will be answered, that this is an imposing array of governing powers, but unfortunately, the parties most concerned are singularly cut off from any voice in the government of themselves. The direction of the Church by the secular arm has been tried, and found very incapable of regulating the affairs of an active religious body. The politicians of the last half-century have taught the Clergy a lesson, which they wish seriously and practically to turn to good account.

It may again be asked, Are not the Bishops in their dioceses the links of union and the arbiters of disputed points, which should keep the Clergy in an efficient state of activity and co-operation? Unfortunately it is felt that they are not equal to this task: that individually or collectively there is a weakness and want of resolute purpose, accompanied often with an ungracious irritability, that is the unconscious substitute for the power of equal justice and quiet strength. The Bishops are unnaturally situated at present, in being without that systematic union of the different orders of Clergy which synodical action is meant to supply. There is, in fact, an unhappy jealousy of Bishops among the Clergy, which is not altogether the fault of either party, but of the system of relationship which exists between them. Episcopal power now is alternately feared for its arbitrary nature, and ridiculed for its helpless incapacity. It can appear in sudden bursts of indignant power against one cause of irritation, and against another, when all the Bench are summoned to a conclave at the Bounty Office, they can bring forth what is only a confession of weakness.

without entering further into this question, we have sufficient grounds to prove, in a general manner, that a

will assume a very different aspect from what has been the case for the last century on similar occasions. There will be assembled in it churchmen whose names are well known, as active and zealous supporters of Convocation. Having been selected by their brother clergy for a certain work, they will be determined by all legitimate means to accomplish their end. They will bring with them the almost unanimous voice of the parochial clergy in their cause, and they will also, on their own parts, bring talent, station, influence, and a resolute will. There will be men, calculated by nature for rough work, if needful, yet bound by their office, and pledged by the respect of their friends, to prefer a peaceful course. There will be fluent orators, ready debaters, prepared to exert their natural powers, then and there, and also prepared to claim their rights, and boldly state the grievances of the Clergy in other ways, if an attempt is made to check the element of our constitution on which they are acting. We cannot foresee the exact course which will be adopted either by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Queen's advisers, but we sincerely trust, that, after examining the justice and equity of the case before them, there will be no arbitrary or summary mode attempted, from either of these quarters, for the purpose of resisting so loud an appeal from the whole mass of those clergy who, scattered about the country, are doing the real work of the Church. Nor, again, let the Bishops, by a majority of the Upper House, take upon themselves the responsibility of refusing to sanction the necessary address to the Crown for the royal licence to debate. On grounds which we have already suggested, this would be an odious proceeding, which we should be sorry to describe according to its merits, until it has been done. But, however the first effort of this present Convocation may end, our conviction, expressed at first, remains the same, that we are warranted in stating Convocation to be already an active power. The body of Proctors now elected, are, in many ways, a *power*, which, with the constitutional sanction they possess, must tell upon all the affairs of Church management, and which can obstruct all other legislation for the Church, until their just claims are conceded.

One caution, also, we would suggest to the advocates of Convocation, in case they really find themselves in active debate. The line we have adopted throughout the whole question has been, to treat of Convocation as an old, not a new thing; to claim it as a legal right, to develop its position by legal facts, and to establish our hold on synodical action generally, by keeping a tight grasp on the details of that form, by which it has so long been preserved in a dormant state among us, till the time should come when a period of activity will follow sleep. In accordance with this view, we should advise that the present

Not so, however, the practical English nation. The intolerable evil lay not in the election, but in the deliberations and quarrels of Convocation, and if these be stopt the election is believed to be a harmless formality. We have no objection to the Clergy loading the blunderbuss as often as they please, provided we are sure it is in our power to prevent them from letting it off. In this, however, we may have somewhat miscalculated. It is better that those who are not intended to use fire-arms should not constantly be in the habit of seeing and handling them, and if we are resolved that the Clergy shall not meet in Convocation, it were better to relieve them from the trouble of an ineffective election, which only serves to remind them of duties they are not destined to perform. We are too busy and too practical a people to indulge in idle ceremonies. There is work to be done in all directions, and when we have been at the trouble of constructing a body, it naturally recalcitrates against the sentence of compulsory idleness. For these reasons it would seem that our present course is indefensible on any principle. If Convocation be elected it ought to be suffered to meet, and if it is never to meet it ought on every reasonable principle never to be elected. The present practice is in either view really indefensible.

‘There are not, however, wanting reasons which supersede the necessity of arguing the matter in the alternative, and which seem to show pretty conclusively, if not to the Clergy, at least to the laity, that Convocation ought never to meet again. It is argued—and plausibly argued—that in proportion as the assistance of the State is withdrawn from the Church of England, it ought to seek an indemnification of its losses in greater internal efficacy and more complete organization. It is said that the Church should seek from within that support which is not conceded her from without, and that if she be placed more nearly on a level with dissenters, she ought to be allowed a freedom of action and power of self-government, such as their separation from the State enables them to enjoy. Enthusiastic men sigh for the vigour and self-regulating power of the voluntary system, and believe that these advantages are consistent with the retention of the temporal advantages and preeminent political position of the Church of England.

‘We have endeavoured to state these arguments fairly, and we believe they admit of a ready and conclusive answer. All religious bodies which have been able efficiently to organize themselves do this by virtue of the unity of their belief. They not merely call themselves by the same name, but they hold the same creed and profess the same doctrines. As long as the infinite varieties of human judgment occasion a decided difference of opinion a schism takes place, the advocates of a new doctrine separate from those of the old, a fresh unit is formed, and a new society, regularly graduated and articulated, and carrying within itself the same germ of present self-government and future division, is formed. In these bodies compromise is unknown; unity of opinion is the condition of their existence; and they rather weaken themselves by eternal subdivision than admit the possibility of allowing discordant opinions to grow up side by side in the same sect.

‘How different is the case of the Church of England! Moulded into her present shape—not by her own internal energy acting from within, but by Parliament pressing on her from without—she possesses every attribute, every advantage, and every disadvantage of a compromise. Her Articles and authorized formularies are so drawn as to admit within her pale persons differing as widely as it is possible for the professors of the Christian religion to differ from each other. The object was evidently not to give predominance to any particular set of opinions, but to include as large a number of persons as the then feelings of the nation would permit within the precincts of the Church. Unity was neither sought nor obtained, but comprehension was aimed at and accomplished. Therefore we have within

in governing this country, and who, so far as they care about the matter, would resist any approach to free action on the part of the Church. It contrasts with most convenient sharpness with the argument which Churchmen use on the other side.

‘The Church of England, it is said, on the one hand is a religious body, founded on a certain religious belief. It must have an organic and constitutional mode of expressing that belief. In theory, Convocation is such a mode, and circumstances now force upon us the necessity of reducing that theory to practice. The Church of England, replies “The Times,”—for this is the real substance of the answer—is *not* a religious body; she has *no* religious opinions of her own, therefore she does not need a voice to express any. To give her such a voice would be merely to furnish her members with an opportunity of wrangling on a large scale, certain to be used while men are what they are, but wholly destructive to the very law of her existence.

‘We shall not attempt to argue this question, but shall merely place the two views in contrast.

‘Churchmen consider that the Bible, whether interpreted by individuals, by the early ages, or by the existing Church, contains an immense mass of truth of which part is distinct, part indistinct; part, in theological phrase, “necessary to salvation,”—an integral portion of that Christian truth by the knowledge of which the human soul is trained for eternal life, part not thus necessary. Real and professed Churches have differed to the utmost extent as what is distinct and what indistinct, what material, and what comparatively immaterial, but on the principle all are agreed. All unite in admitting that a line must be drawn somewhere. No body of Christians would allow Mahometanism to be taught in their churches as the religion of the Bible—none would compel all their members to believe precisely alike on the nature of the heavenly joys. But till now it has been considered that, whatever questions might be left open, a certain amount of religious belief was necessary to the existence of a religious body; that the Church of England was such a body, and that her very definite belief was to be found in her Prayer-Book and Articles, which exclude from her body, not only Roman Catholics (though this alone would be sufficient for our argument), but whole masses of so-called heretics, too numerous to be counted by any but a theologian. And we may perhaps remark, in passing, that till within the last ten or twelve years the popular charge against the Church of England has been, not that her formularies and practice were too lax in this respect, but that they were intolerably rigid, and she herself jealous and intolerant in her enforcement of them. And finally, this dogmatism of hers has been distinctly accepted by the State, which *inter alia* has retained to the present day for its Sovereign the title of Defender of the Faith.

‘The fact that the Church of England has spoken ambiguously on some points, be they ever so important, does not in any degree interfere with, or modify the fact that she has spoken with all the clearness of which language is capable on others, and those others constitute her religious belief. Whether her definitions are too many or too few, there they are, shaped by her divines, adopted by her ecclesiastical authorities, recognised and enforced by the laws of her country, and forming a basis on which is built a superstructure, comprising some 15,000 Clergy and the laity in communion with them. Whatever differences may exist within that body, no reasonable man can pretend to believe that if Unitarianism were proclaimed to-morrow as the national religion, that body would either cease to exist or become Socinian. In such an event the Church would at once lose all that she holds as organ of the State; she would, in all probability, be speedily robbed

ART. IV.—*The Monthly Packet of Evening Readings, 1852 ;
A Garland for the Year.*

It would be an inquiry, equally curious and profitable, which should investigate that which we may call the domestic influence of the Mediæval Church. How ecclesiastical festivals became seasons of home enjoyment; how holy days were turned into holidays; how the Church's children learnt, in private life, to think and to speak in the Church's way; how, ascending higher, the powers of this world, the governors of the state, fell almost unconsciously into the times and the seasons of her who is not of this world; how, for example, sheriffs were pricked on the morrow of S. Martin; how lawyers reckoned by Hilary or Trinity term; how every class was subject to the same moulding influence; how boys went a *Midlenting*, and peasants hunted the wren on S. Stephen's day, and kings held their Maundy. Merchants, over their ledgers, spoke the language, at least, of religion; till very lately, bills of lading always commenced with the words, '*I, A. B. do send greeting in the Lord God everlasting*;' nor are the formulæ quite obsolete, '*The ship C. whereof D. E. under God is master*;' nor yet that, '*To sail with the first fair wind that God shall send*.' Gems were invested with a thousand mystical significations in the eyes of the jeweller; the country simpler had his Lent Lilies, his Herb Trinity, his Our Lord and Lady, his Alleluia Flower, his Star of Bethlehem.¹ Children began their Alphabet with a *Criscross*; countrymen saw in the ass the token of our Lord's entry into Jerusalem; suicides were buried in a cross way. It was the same influence always and everywhere at work; sometimes beautifully, sometimes amusingly, sometimes extravagantly, but always most really. The Church, whatever her language, was herself vernacular.

We propose to give a few of the national and provincial terms which have been impressed on Ecclesiastical Holydays. It

¹ The Church names of flowers are most ably given in the series of papers which stands at the head of this Article. We know not where we have read a series combining so much of ecclesiastical research, with such a sense of the picturesque, and so much love for English landscape; in fact, every way so perfectly delightful. We recommend it very strongly to our readers, and we trust that the labours of the Author (or perhaps Authoress), will be extended to other parts of nature, when the present set shall conclude with the year. Birds and insects would afford a large scope. To give an instance from the latter:—The Lady-bird, or Lady-cow, (of course called from Our Lady,) is in Spanish the *Vaquilla de Dios* (God's little v); in German, the May-Lady; in French, the *Bête à bon Dieu*; in Russ, *Boja-vka* (God's Cow).

may not be entirely useless to dwell on them; for we are not yet perfectly rid of that stiffness which led men, at the beginning of the movement, to call Christmas Eve the Vigil of the Nativity, and to date letters on the Monday of Pentecost. That a Church should really be national, her terms must be household words; as they have always most been when a national Church was most efficient. Without further preface, we will begin with the commencement of the Ecclesiastical year.

It is curious that the season of Advent should have retained its Latin name everywhere. The Sundays, indeed, were not always reckoned in the same way, the more usual method being to count the first as the fourth, and that nearest to Christmas as the first. The old rule for finding the first Sunday in Advent ran thus:—

Saint Andrew the King
Three weeks and three days before Christmas comes in :
Three days after, or three days before,
Advent Sunday knocks at the door.

The old Hispanic Advent had six weeks, the Sunday next after Martinmas being the first;¹ and this is also the case in the Ambrosian rite.

Church saws fixed the commencement of winter to S. Clement's Day. The usual lines which regulate the beginning of the Seasons are:—

Dat Clemens hyemem; dat Petri ver Cathedratus :
Æstuat Urbanus: autumnat Symphorianus.

We have read them thus in a Cambray Missal:—

Cedit hyems retro cathedrato Simone Petro.
Ver fugat Urbanus; æstatem Symphorianus.
Festum Clementis caput est hyemis venientis.

Or, if the reader wishes a version:—

Winter goes off, and skies grow fair,
When Simon Peter sits in Chair :
Saint Urban bids the Spring be gone :
Symphorian calls the autumn on :
Saint Clement's day the wind and rain
And cold of winter brings again.

And a very fair division too, if we add to the times specified, (February 22, May 25, August 22, and November 21,) the eight or ten days that the correction of the Calendar, at the date when these verses were written, would have required.

¹ When the Dominical letter is A, there are, in fact, seven Sundays in the Mozarabic Advent. But in that case the seventh falls on Christmas Eve, and the office is of that day entirely.

The season of Advent has left few traces in natural names. *Advent-grass* hence receives its title; and in Germany wild geese are called *Advent-birds*, and sometimes, as also with us, *Ember-geese*.

The English Calendar gives the old rule for the discovery of the Advent Ember-days; the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, after S. Lucy's Day.

Fasting days and Emberings be
Lent, Whitsun, Holyrood, and Lucie;

said the rhyme. The modern Roman use fixes them to the third week in Advent, which must always come to the same thing.

The cristate verses give three of the four:—

Dant Crux, Lucia, Cineres, charismata dia,
Ut sit in angariâ quarta sequens feria.

The Latin name has remained in modern languages, though the contrary is sometimes affirmed, *Quatuor Tempora*, the *Four Times*. In French and Italian the term is the same; in Spanish and Portuguese they are simply *Temporas*. The German converts them into *Quatember*, and thence, by the easy corruption of dropping the first syllable, a corruption which also takes place in some German dialects, we get the English *Ember*. Thus, there is no occasion to seek after an etymology in embers; or with Nelson, to extravagate still further to the noun *ymbren*, a recurrence, as if all holy seasons did not equally recur. In Welsh, Ember-week is *Wythnos y cydgorian*, the Week of the Processions.

We proceed to Christmas. In most Celtic languages Christmas Eve is called the *Night of Mary*. It is still observed with great pomp in the Isle of Man, the peasants vying with each other in bringing tapers to church, and in singing carols there. The festival itself is variously named. Our own *Christmas* comes nearest to the German provincialism, *Christfest*. The Romance languages merely retain the Latin name, the French deviating from it most widely in *Noel*. This word became a cry of joy; we find it sung at Angers, during the eight days preceding Christmas, fifteen times at the conclusion of Lauds, and it thus came to be used at other seasons of rejoicing. So, Monstrelet frequently tells us of the cry of Noel that accompanied some triumphant procession. The Welsh *Nadolig* is from the same source. The German *Weihnachten* has been derived from *Wein*, as if expressing the festal character of the day. But it is clearly from the inseparable compound *Weih*, which denotes sanctity or holiness, and occurs so often in German ecclesiastical words. Its composition with the word

The Epiphany, as it contains in itself three distinct festivals, so it was to be expected that we should find it known by a variety of distinct names. In the Spanish *Epifania*, and the Italian provincialism, *Befania*, the Greek name is simply retained. In old Spanish, however, we find it called *Apparicion*, derived from the Mozarabic ritual, which gives the *Apparitio Domini*. So in the Abbey of Fontevraud, it was *L'Apparition*. Our common English name, *Twelfth Night*, marks it out as the conclusion of Christmas-tide. For the most part, however, national usages connect its title with the worship of the Magi. So in German, it is *Dreykönigstag*; in Danish, *Hellig Tre Kongers Dag*; in French, *Les Rois*; in Portuguese, *Dia dos Reis*. In England also, to some extent, the festival was known as the *Three Kings' Day*, and the practice of drawing for king is a relic of that use. In Manx, it is *Laa'l-Chybbyr-ushkeey*, the day of offering worship. In the East, the case was different. Here, as every one knows, the 6th of January was at first celebrated as the Feast of the Nativity, and Manifestation to the Gentiles, both in one; and the opposite practice was introduced from the Roman Church. The name Epiphany was still, however, applied in many cases to Christmas Day, and the universally received title for our Epiphany was *The Lights*; the Sundays before and after it also deriving their name from that appellation. The title originally bore reference to the illumination of Baptism, instituted, according to the more probable opinion, on that day, and afterwards to the candles with which, as symbolical of that, the churches of the East blaze. There it is still a festival of superior importance to Christmas, and in many churches of mediæval France the case was the same; as at Rouen, where it received the name of the *Star Feast*. Again, the solemn benediction of the waters in the East, has given a title, in some countries, to the day. Thus, in Illyria and Bulgaria it is known as the *Vodocaerscta*, the 'Benediction of the Water;' in Russia, *Creshitshenie*, the Slavonic term for Baptism. In Welsh the festival is sometimes termed *Ystwyll*, gloom-expelling, sometimes *Serenwyl*, Star Festival.

The morrow of the Epiphany was popularly called *S. Distaff's Day*, from the goodwife reassuming her distaff after the Christmas holyday:—

Partly work, and partly play,
Ye must on Saint Distaff's Day.

But this, of course, was simply a jocular appellation. *Plough Monday*, on the contrary, had, in some rituals, its own benediction.

The Sundays after Epiphany have been named solely from

their numbers; it being very rare, even in ancient Missals, to find them called from their introits. In the north of Italy, however, the second is known as *Marriage Sunday*, from the marriage of Cana, related in the gospel for the day.

The Purification was, in one sense, to the West, what the Epiphany was to the East, and has usually received its name from the multitude of tapers employed in the office, with reference, primarily, to the Light to lighten the Gentiles, which was then manifested by the mouth of Simeon. The French Church calls it *La Chandeleur*; in Spain and Portugal it is the *Candelaria*; in Denmark, it is the *Kyndelmisse*; in Germany, as *Lichtmesse*; in Suabia, as *Kerzweihe*, or *Kerzmesse*. In Welsh it is *Gryl Vair y Canwyllau*, the Festival of Mary of the Candles; in Manx, for a reason we cannot explain, it is *Laa'l Moirrey my Giangle*, the Day of Mary's being tied or secured. But, in the Eastern Church, it derives its name from the meeting of our Lord by Simeon and Anna; and is there termed *Hypapante*; by the Russian Church, with the same meaning, *Srietenie*. And this name was, as so often, transferred to the Latin Church, by which it was written *Hypapanti*; an easy corruption reduced this to *Hypanti*, which was the most frequent mediæval name. In the north of Italy it was often termed *S. Simeon's Day*; in France the name was, in many instances, the same as that in our Calendar—the *Presen-tation*. We also meet with that of *Susception Day*.

S. Blaise's Day is, in some parts of Germany, *Kleine Kerzmesse*—little Candlemas—because of the bonfires that it was usual (for an uncertain reason) to kindle on that night. One thing is clear—that the custom, not being peculiar to England, could not have arisen in an absurd pun on the saint's name, as some have affirmed.

The week before Septuagesima Sunday is, in the Eastern Church, called the *Exhortatory Week*, because the faithful are then exhorted to prepare themselves manfully for the great fast. The Nestorians term it the *Ninevites' Week*, on account of a fast which they observe in commemoration of the repentance of Nineveh. The Armenians, who do the same, name it, from an uncertain reason, the *Artziburion*. 'At that time,' says a Greek divine, with bitterness that recalls some of Mr. Goode's polemical performances, 'the thrice accursed Armenians observe their abominable fast of Artziburion.' The Saturday of the week was known as *Alleluia Saturday*, because *Alleluia* was then, according to the most usual rule, dropped till Easter. Hence we have the beautiful hymn, *Alleluia dulce carmen*, and the magnificent *Alleluatic* sequence, appointed for that day.

Septuagesima almost everywhere retained its Latin name.

In the Eastern Church it is the *Sunday of the Prodigal Son*, that being the Gospel for the day. The week that succeeds is, in the East, *Apocreo*s, because from Septuagesima Sunday meat is forbidden.

Sexagesima also had only its Latin title. In the East it is the Sunday of *Apocreo*s; the weeks, at that time of the year, preceding, and not following their Sunday. The ensuing week is, in the East, *Cheese Week*; in Russia, *Butter Week*; because, till the close of the following Sunday, cheese and butter are allowed. The Friday of *Sexagesima* was, in the north of Germany, the *Kind-fest*, or *Kind-tag*, being, by a peculiar rite, the Festival of the Invention of the Child in the Temple.

Quinquagesima. In Germany this is, in many places, called *Pfaffen-Fastnacht* (Priest's Fasting Night), many mediæval councils having ordered ecclesiastics to abstain from meat from that day forward. It was also very widely known as *Esto mihi Sunday*, from the commencement of the introit, *Esto mihi in Deum Protectorem*. In the patois of Navarre it is *Dimenge cabée*, a corruption of *Dominica in Capite Jejunii*. In Denmark it is *Fastelavn's Sondag*, Sunday of the Preparation for the Fast. In the East, for the reason given above, it is *Butter* or *Cheese Sunday*.

The following Monday is, in England, *Collop Monday*; because, on that day, the last meat, and that in small quantities, was supposed to be cooked. In Vienne, and the adjacent parts of France, it was (and still is) *Fat Monday* (*Lundi gras*), for the following reason:—Some provincial Councils endeavoured to commence the fast, as in the East, on this day, instead of on the Wednesday; the people compromised the matter by beginning it on Tuesday, and hence this title for the last flesh-day.

Shrove Tuesday. Here, as so often, the English name is beyond all dispute the most beautiful and appropriate of any; expressing the penitence with which Lent should be welcomed in. In Southern Europe it takes its name from the exact reverse, namely, from the Carnival. In Italy it is *Martedì grasso*, as in France *Mardi gras*; also *Martedì di Carnovale*. The Spanish Church terms it *Martes de carnestolendas*; the Portuguese, *Dia do Entrudo*; or, more commonly, *Entrudo* alone; from the old word *entrudar*, to feast. Again, in France, we have *Carême entrant*; or, in the old mediæval form, *Carementramnus*. In Walloon patois, *Mâdicâmentran*. In Dansk, on the same principle as *Quinquagesima Sunday*, it is *Fastelavnstirstag*; in Germany it is usually known as *Fastendienstag*, Fast Tuesday. In Welsh Shrovetide is *Ynyd*, which is probably derived from *Initium Quadragesimæ*, the beginning of Lent, and thus also the Manx, *Oie-innyd*.

Ash Wednesday has, in most Churches, its name from the benediction and the wearing of ashes on that day. Thus, in German, it is *Ascher Mittwoch*; in Dansk, *Aske Onsdag*; in Illyrian, *Cista Srijda*; French, *Le jour de Cendres*; in Spanish, *Miercoles de Ceniza*; in Portuguese, *Quarta feira de cinza*. But, from also being Wednesday in *Capite Jejunii*, it is, in Navarre, *Mercré cabée*, like *Quinquagesima Sunday*.

Lent itself has three classes of appellations. In the first place, those derived from the season of the year, as our own *Lent*, akin to the German *Lenz*, and identical with the Dutch and the Flemish *Lente*, the season of spring. Next, those which have their origin from the idea of the fast. So in Russ it is *Velekie Post*, the Great Fast; or simply *Post*, the Fast. In Dansk, *Fastetid*; in German, *Fastenzeit*. So, in the Eastern Church, it is simply the *Μεγάλη Νηστεία*. Thirdly, those derived from the number of days it lasts: *Quadragesima* in Latin, *Carême* in French. And this is the case in all the Romance languages, and so also in Welsh, where Lent is *Garaucys*, and, in Manx, *Kargys*. Its weeks, when numerically reckoned, are forwarder by one in the East than in the West. The first week in Lent is, according to the rite of Constantinople, that which follows *Quinquagesima*: according to the use of Rome it is that which follows the first Sunday in Lent.

The day after Ash Wednesday is named, in some parts of England, *Embering Thursday*.

The first Sunday in Lent. Good old Durandus labours to explain why this should be called *Quadragesima*, when, in point of fact, it is not the fortieth, but the two-and-fortieth, day from Easter. His mystical reasons, if not convincing, are at least beautiful: 'Because Lent reacheth not save to Maundy Thursday, which is the day of absolution; for by means of Lent well observed, and by true penitence, man spiritually cometh to the Supper of the LAMB; as it is written: "Blessed are they that are called to the marriage supper of the LAMB." Again, because the children of Israel, being fed with manna in the desert by the space of forty years, came, through forty encampments, to the Land of Promise. By whose pattern we also, abstaining forty days from the lusts of the body, are refreshed by the word of life, and give ourselves up to prayer, that so we may enter by JESUS CHRIST into the land of the living; even as they by Jesus Nave, that is, Joshua, into the Land of Promise.' The more common name, however, was from the introit, the Sunday *Invocavit*. So we often read: 'The emperor arrived at Metz on the Tuesday after *Invocavit*.' 'The Council was begun on the Wednesday of the week called *Invocavit*.' It was sometimes termed *Quintana*, because five Sundays intervened between it and Easter. Our old vernacular

name was *Shrove Sunday*. In some parts of Germany it was *Alte Fasnacht*, Old Fast Night,—a relic of the ancient commencement of Lent on the following day, before the additional four days were added to complete the forty. In the East it is *Orthodoxy Sunday*, a festival instituted primarily to commemorate the final defeat of the Iconoclasts, but extended to a general commemoration of all triumphs of the Faith.

The second Sunday in Lent is also, from the introit, the Sunday *Reminiscere*. In France it was sometimes called *Transfiguration Sunday*, because that event, according to the use of Paris, formed the Gospel of the day.

The third Sunday, or the Sunday *Oculi*, has not, to our knowledge, any vernacular name in the West, but in the East it is *σταυροπροσκυνήσιμος*, from the Adoration of the Cross on that day.

The fourth, or *Lætare Sunday*, is called both by the East and West, *Midlent Sunday*. In the West it is also termed *Refection Sunday*, partly because the Gospel for the day relates the feeding of the five thousand, partly because it was observed as a little carnival between the two halves of Lent; as now, the *Mi-Carême* in Paris is an occasion of great gaiety and splendour. In Rome, it is the Sunday of the *Golden Rose*, from the benediction of that token of the Pontiff's approbation. It was frequently termed in Spain the Sunday *Mediante*, because it exactly halved the old Spanish Lent, and because the Gospel commences with that word.

Thursday of the Midlent Week is, in the Eastern Church, *Thursday of the Great Canon*, because the hymn of S. Andrew of Crete, known by that name, is then sung.

The fifth Sunday is *Passion Sunday*, because then the Western Church begins her more solemn commemoration of the Passion. Then the two glorious hymns of Venuntius Fortunatus, *Vexilla Regis prodeunt*, and *Pange lingua gloriosi prælum certaminis*, begin to be said. It was also sometimes called *Midlent Sunday*, because it follows the Midlent week; there being many instances in the West, where the Eastern example of considering the Sunday as the last day of the week may be traced. More properly it was called *Midlent Octave*. In Germany we find it named *Black Sunday*, with reference to the veiling of the crosses in black, which takes place at that passage of the Gospel, 'Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple.'

The Saturday of Passion Week, or as the Eastern Church calls it, Palm Week, was named in the south of Europe, *Alms Saturday*, it being customary to bestow charity on the poor, in remembrance of our Lord's words spoken on that day, 'Ye have the poor always with you, and whensoever ye will, ye may do them good.' In the East, it is appropriately named

S. Lazarus's Saturday, and often, both by East and West, *Palm Saturday*.

The sixth Sunday in Lent has a variety of names, most of them beautiful and appropriate. In England, Holland, Germany, and Denmark, it is *Palm Sunday*; in Italy, *Olive Sunday*; in Spain, Portugal, and France, *Branch Sunday*; in Welsh, *Flower Sunday*. In Russia, it is *Verknie Voscresenie, Sallow Sunday*, from the necessary employment of sallows in the procession. For a similar reason, it is in various parts of England, *Willow Sunday*, or *Yew Sunday*. Again, it was named *Tradition Sunday*, because on that day the Creed was taught to the catechumens who were to be baptized on Easter Eve; *Indulgence Sunday*, from an uncertain reason; *Palm Easter*; the *Capitulum*, because it was then usual to wash the heads of the children, who were about to be baptized; *Flower-Easter*; *Easter of the Competents*, or *Pascha petitum*, because of the tradition of the Creed to those who were competent for baptism; *Hosanna Sunday*, or merely *Hosanna*, in the South of Europe, as it is in the Coptic Church. In the Greek Ritual it is simply *Palm Sunday*, though sometimes called *S. Lazarus's Sunday*. In Georgia, by a singular reference to S. Mary Magdalene, it is *Bzobisa Aghebisa, Prostitution Sunday*.

The sixth week in Lent is, in all the Romance languages, as with us, *Holy Week*. The title *Passion Week*, so often bestowed improperly on it among ourselves, is in Russia given to it by right, *Strastnoe Nedelie*. The Latin term, the Greater Week, *Hebdomada Major*, does not seem to have come into vernacular use. In old French it was called, as it sometimes is still, *La Semaine Peneuse*. The most beautiful term, however, as setting forth its abstraction from worldly labours, and its holy quiet, is that by which it is known in Germany and Denmark, the *Still Week*. In Germany it is also the *Marterwoche*, and *Car* or *Charwoche*, Suffering Week. In the East it is the *Great Week*, and each day has the same epithet, Great Monday, Great Tuesday, &c. Finally, in many mediæval writers, it is the *Authentic Week*; in the sense, we suppose, of the week,—the Week that is a week indeed; and so we have found it named in a Mayence Missal of 1519. The Welsh call it *Wythnos y Grog*, the Week of the Cross.

We come now to *Maundy Thursday*. It is rather singular that this day should not have derived its vernacular name from its great institution, the Blessed Eucharist. It had, indeed, in mediæval Latin, the name, *The Birthday of the Chalice*. So Peter of Blois:—

Hoc in Natali Calicis non est celebratum,
Quando Pascha novum vetus est post Pascha dicatum.

But, in modern languages, this did not obtain. In Dansk

we have the name of *Skærtorsdag*, as, in some parts of England, that of *Sheer Thursday*, from the old root *Skier*, signifying pain or affliction. In France it is simply *Jeudi Saint*, a term likely to be confounded with Ascension Day. In German it is *Grüne Donnerstag*, Green Thursday; the origin of the term is much disputed. It is probable, however, that the epithet is here to be taken in the sense of *unripe*, inasmuch as in Slavonia and Carinthia the day is called *Raw Thursday*, with what reference we are quite unable to explain. In Spain, as with us, it is *Juéves del Mandato*, from the performance of the *mandatum*, the washing of the feet. In Portugal it is *Quinta Feira de Endoenças*, Sickness Thursday, on account of the consecration of the chrism for the unction of the sick. In Welsh, with reference to the mocking of our Lord, it is *Iau y Cablyd*, Thursday of Blasphemy.

Good Friday is another example of an English appellation that surpasses in beauty the vernacular terms of other languages. But that we are so completely used to it, we should probably feel what a touching acknowledgment is the name of the work accomplished on that day. In some parts of England it is *Char-Friday*, that is, Passion Friday; a name also in use in Germany. There, however, it is usually called *Still Friday*. Denmark has a far less appropriate name, *Long Friday*. It is not a mark of very high devotion, that the length of the office should be that which has given the title to the day. *Black Friday*, a name common over Southern Germany, gives the popular view of the season, and *Holy Friday* is the somewhat common-place title adopted in most of the Romance languages. In Welsh, it is *Gwener y Croglith*, Friday of the Lesson of the Cross.

Easter Eve has in few modern languages any more recondite name than in our own. In Portugal it is *Sabbado de Alleluia*, from the triumphant resumption of the Alleluia in the first vespers of Easter. In the East, in the same way as the rest of the week, it is *Great Saturday*, except among the Armenians, who call it *Burial Saturday*.

We come now to the Queen of Festivals. And here the Greek and Latin name, in various corruptions, is almost universal; appearing in the French *Pâque*, in the Portuguese *Pascoa*, in the Illyrian *Paska*, and (which is rather strange) in the Danish *Paaske*, and the Welsh *Pasg*. The English *Easter*, and the German *Ostern*, from the goddess *Eostre*, whose feast fell in April, afford a curious instance how the Church, when it suits her, lays hold of a Pagan word, and adapts it to her highest and holiest purposes. This derivation, however, does not seem to have pleased ritualists. So, for example, the piety of Honorius of Autun is more conspicuous than his etymology

in the following sentence :—‘ *Oster* is from *the East*, because as ‘ there the Sun ariseth, who, as it were, dies in his setting, so ‘ here the Sun of Righteousness, which is Christ, who, as it ‘ were, sets in his Death, rises again.’ Others will deduce from *Urstand*, the Resurrection. But these are vain attempts to get rid of an etymology, of which, after all, there is nothing to be ashamed. In Manx, it is *Yn-chaisht*, ‘The Holy.’ In the East, the common title is *Λαμπρά*, the Bright Day. Thus a Cretan ballad, describing the celebration of the principal feasts of the Church :—

τοῦ Χριστουγέννου γὰ κήρι,
καὶ τοῦ βαίον γὰ βαία
καὶ τῆς Λαμπρῆς τὴν κυριακὴν
γὰ τὸ ‘Χριστὸς ἀνέστη.’

At Christmas tapers kindle,
At Palm-tide Palm-gifts bring;
And then upon *Bright Sunday*
“The Lord is risen,” we sing.

The use is the same in the Russian Church, where Easter Day is the *Svietloe Vosresenie*.

The Octave of Easter is, with us, *Low Sunday*, probably from the contrast between the rapturous joy of Easter, and the more ordinary routine to which we now return. At the same time, in every part of the Western Church, it is a Sunday of the first class. In the Latin Church, it is the *Dominica in Albis*, that is, *in Albis depositis*, because then the recently baptized laid aside their white robes. But the Germans, translating exactly from the Latin, call it *der weisse Sonntag*, for precisely the reason that it is not white. It is as often called the Sunday *Quasimodo*, from the introit. In the canton of Soleure, in Switzerland, it is *Bean Sunday*, on account of a certain distribution of beans which then takes place, and by which the translation of some of the Martyrs of the Theban Legion is commemorated. In the East, it is *New Sunday*, with reference to the Renovation of all things by our Lord’s Resurrection.

Mundi renovatio
Nova parit gaudia :
Resurgente Domino
Conresurgunt omnia.

It is thus named also by the Armenians. The Greeks frequently call it *Antipascha*, and also *S. Thomas’s Sunday*, in commemoration of his conversion on that day.

While in Easter-tide, we must not forget to mention the *Annotine Easter*. This was a commemoration of the preceding Easter, made on that day in the following year. There is a

sequence for this festival—the only one with which we are acquainted—in Mr. Neale's collection, beginning,

Surgit Christus cum trophæo,
Jam ex Agno factus Leo.

As, however, Annotine Easter fell often in Lent, and sometimes in Passion-tide, it was in most Churches transferred either to the Sunday *Quasimodo*, or to the Fourth Sunday after Easter, or in some cases, to Saturday in the Octave. The origin of its institution seems to have been the natural wish of those baptized at Easter, to celebrate the first anniversary of their spiritual illumination.

The Second Sunday after Easter. This, in the Eastern Church, is the Sunday of the Ointment-bearers (τῶν μυροφορῶν), from the Gospel. In the Armenian Calendar, it is *Green Sunday*, because the spring is now, at latest, bursting forth.

The Third Sunday after Easter. This, for a similar reason to that mentioned above, is, in the East, the *Sunday of the Paralytic*. Why the Armenian Church calls it *Beautiful Sunday*, we know not.

The Fourth Sunday after Easter is, with the Greeks, Mid-Pentecost, from dividing the time between Easter and Whit-Sunday. Also, from the Gospel, it is the *Sunday of the Samaritan*.

The fifth is *Rogation Sunday*, with the three Rogation Days following. In Germany this is the *Betsontag*, with the same meaning: in other languages the Latin term seems almost invariably followed. The Oriental Church, retaining the old rule of admitting no fast between Easter and Pentecost, has no such season, and therefore no such name. The Gotho-Hispanic Church, wishing to observe the Rogations, and yet unwilling to break the canon, transferred them either to the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday in the week of Pentecost, or else to the Ides or to the Kalends of December. In the East, Rogation Sunday is the *Sunday of the Blind Man*, from the Gospel.

Ascension Day has scarcely any vernacular name. In some parts of the south of France it was termed *Bread Thursday*, from a distribution of bread which then was made to the poor; probably with reference to that verse of the Psalm, 'Thou art gone up on high: Thou hast led captivity captive, and received gifts for men.' In England it has been known as *Bounds Thursday*; from beating the bounds of the parish, transferred, by a corruption of Rogation processions, to this day. In Manx, it is *Jasdyll*, which they derive from *Jas*, God, and *theill*, the world, because God on that day went up to Heaven from the world. In Russia, they use an especial term for this day, instead of the more ordinary word for *Ascension*: calling it *Voznesenie*, and not *Voschojdenie*. The Eastern Church knows

of no especial title for the festival, except that, in Cappadocia, from an uncertain reason, it was the *Episozomene*.

The *Sunday after Ascension* is so called all over the West. But in the East it is termed the *Sunday of the Three Hundred and Eighteen*, from the commemoration which then takes place of the Fathers of Nicæa.

Whit Sunday. It is strange that the origin of our vernacular name for the third festival of the Christian year should be so difficult to discover. We will not discuss the disputed question, whether it is named from the white worn by the recently baptized from Easter till Pentecost, or is a corruption of *huit*: this being the eighth Sunday after Easter. The Romance languages have, for the most part, vernacularized the Latin name. But in Spain the day is usually called the *Fiesta del Espirito Santo*; and in Portugal, by the use of the word *Pascha* we already noticed, *Pascoa do Espirito Santo*. In Italy it is *Pasqua Rosata*, because the roses are now in full flower. In Germany, it is *Pfingsten*, probably (for the derivation is doubtful) a corruption of Pentecost. The name will suggest to some of our readers Göthe's beautiful imitation of Reynard the Fox:—

Pfingsten, das liebliche Fest, war gekommen: es grünt und blüthen
Feld und Wald: auf Hügeln und Höhn, in Büschen und Hecken,
Uebten ein fröhliches Lied die neuermunterten Vögel, &c.

In Dansk, by an easy abbreviation, it is *Pintse-Dag*. From the season, German every-day speech names a number of common objects: thus, green geese are *Pentecost geese*; the peony is the *Pentecost rose*; broom is *Pentecost-blossom*. In Russ it is *Troitzie Den*, Trinity Day; probably as filling up the commemoration of the blessed Trinity. In the East it is, of course, Pentecost.

The Friday in the Octave is, among the Nestorians, named *Golden Friday*. For that day of the week being a high commemoration throughout the year, this, in its most sacred season, is supposed to bear the palm from the others; and hence its title.

It was not to be expected that *Trinity Sunday*, as a day of such late institution, should have left much trace in modern languages. In old French it was popularly called the *King of Sundays*; also *Blessed Sunday*. In the Eastern Church it is *All Saints' Sunday*, that commemoration being fixed for this day. The office itself was long unsettled in the Western Church. The original collect for the First Sunday after Pentecost was that which begins, 'O God, the strength of all them that put their trust in Thee,' and it is still retained in the Roman Missal as an adjunct to the festival of the Trinity.

The German Church was very tenacious of the old rite. Some celebrated the new festival on the second Sunday after Pentecost, so as to leave the octave clear; large numbers transferred it to the Sunday next before Advent: and this was, we believe, retained in some parts of Rhineland to the last century, if indeed there be not even now a double commemoration. So it was at Orleans till the sixteenth century.

Corpus Christi also, as a late festival, comes under the same head as the last. That, in England, as abroad, it was called from the Body of God, the vulgar oath still remains to tell. The French Church has abbreviated it still further, into the *Fête Dieu*.

The Sundays following Trinity are, in the Roman Calendar, as every one knows, called from Pentecost. But in the Sarum, and in most German Missals, they are named, as we name them, from Trinity.

We may observe that in the north of England, and especially in Yorkshire, the Sunday within the Octave of the Patron, or Wake Saint, is called after his name. Thus, at Ripon, *Wilfrid Sunday* is a very great holiday.

It merely remains to notice the other holidays which have received an English vernacular name.

Of these Lady Day shall be the first. That this term was fixed to the Annunciation and not to the Assumption, shows that, in the earlier times of England, the present respective importance of the festivals was reversed. In Dansk it is the same, *Vor Fruedag*; but in other European tongues it is simply the Annunciation. In Welsh it is *Gwyl Vair y Cyhydedd*, the Festival of Mary of the Equinox; in Manx, prettily enough, *Laa'l-Moirrey-my-Sansh*, the Day of Mary's being whispered to.

Lammas Day, the Feast of S. Peter ad Vincula. It would be most natural to derive this from Loaf-mas, that is, the benediction of the new bread. But when we find the first of August termed in Welsh *Dydd degwm i'cyn*, Lamb-tithing day, it is clear that the easier derivative, Lamb-mas Day, is also the true one. The Manx name has in all likelihood the same origin; it is *Laa'l Lhuany's*. *Lhuan* is any creature, more especially a lamb or calf, which comes out of due season. It was probably the absence of an octave, as compared with the great festival of S. Peter, that led to the proverbial idiom, *At latter Lammas*; that is, never: or, as the Danes say, on the 30th of February. In Germany the day is *Kettenfeier*, the Feast of the Chains,—a literal translation of the Latin.

The same feeling which suggested the English benediction showed itself in all the wine countries on the sixth of August. This was the benediction of the new grapes;—and the rite was

often performed, as at S. Martin of Tours, by squeezing a grape into the chalice after consecration. So we have *Le jour des raisins*, in Germany, *Traubentag*; in the Moselle districts, *Liebfrauenmilchtag*, the Day of the Milk of our Dear Lady (from the celebrated wine so called); in the dialect of Alsace and Strásbourg, *Wainbatredag*. The Benediction of the Grapes took place on the same day in the East.

An instance is within our knowledge of the endowment of a Post-Reformation Sermon, "to be preached on Lady Day in harvest," *i.e.* on the Assumption.

Saint Monday is, properly speaking, the Monday after S. Crispin: a great holiday. In Dansk it is *Frimandag*, Holiday Monday: why the Germans call it Blue Monday we know not.

Hallowmas, or *All Hallows*, or *All Holland*, has scarcely any peculiar name elsewhere than among ourselves. In Germany it is simply *Allerheiligen*; and in the Romance languages, a pure translation of *Festum Omnium Sanctorum*.

All Souls. This, in Welsh, is *Gwyl y meirw*, the Festival of the Dead, and sometimes, more poetically, *Gwyl cenad y meirw*, the Festival of the Embassy of the Dead. In Spanish it is *El día de las animas*; in Portuguese, more curiously, it is the *Dia dos finados*, from *finado*, a dead body. In Italy it is the *Giorno de' morti*. In Germany, precisely as with us.

St. Thomas's Eve is, in Manx, *Oie'l-fingan*, the Eve of Cliffs; because men then went out on the cliffs to shoot venison for the approaching Christmas Festival.

This list might, undoubtedly, with greater research, and wider opportunity, be well-nigh indefinitely extended. We believe, for example, that the nearly unknown Basque has very curious ecclesiastical terms: we are told that the Wallachian, notwithstanding its almost literal derivation from the Latin, is rich in the same. In short, wherever the Church was early planted, there her influence over domestic language will appear very strongly; where she was not established till a late period, there such vernacularisms are scarcely, or not at all, perceptible. This, we believe, is true to a great extent in Bohemia, more so in Poland, and still more so in Lithuania. But the examples which have been produced will not have been given in vain, if they lead any one to consider how completely the Church should mingle herself with the household words of her children, and should, even in this sense, become all things to all men.

ART. V.—*Report of the Trial and Preliminary Proceedings in the case of the Queen on the Prosecution of G. Achilli v. Dr. Newman. With an Introduction, containing Comments on the Law and on the course of the Trial; also with the Pleadings and Affidavits; and copious Notes, particularly on the Constitution and Practice of the Court of Inquisition. By W. F. FINLASON, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister at Law, Author of 'Leading Cases in Pleading,' 'Charitable Trusts,' &c. Third Edition. Dolman. 1852.*

WHATEVER may be the defects in regard to knowledge, ability, or discretion—whatever the obliquities in theology, or errors in taste, for which this review may be answerable, there is one merit to which it may lay an indisputable claim, in common, we hope, with the other religious reviews of the country, viz. that it may safely lie upon the drawing-room tables of respectable families. Nor, it is needless to say, do we undervalue this measure of success, which is creditable as far as it goes, though it would be a false and uncalled-for humility to say that we do not aim at something higher. An ordinary reader, however, whose eye casually rested on the title of the publication prefixed to this article, would certainly deserve some excuse, if he came for the moment to an opposite opinion. A review that undertakes a comment on the Achilli trial would seem at first sight to have adopted a certain indifference to the merit of respectability, and in the pursuit of a theological name, to have flung aside its social, as if that were a thing too homely and mediocre to care about. Who can touch pitch and not be defiled? Who can make observations on the Achilli trial which may be fit for the ears of respectable men and women? Such will probably be the idea of many of our readers, on this article first catching their attention. For the sake of such apprehensions, therefore, we hasten to announce that this review does not undervalue and despise the praise of being a respectable one, and that we do not intend to offend the most delicate and refined ear. The inference which we shall draw from this trial will not depend on any of the details of that elaborate interior which divines of the sister Church have so industriously thrown open to the public; it will only require the large and general facts of the case for its support.

We shall commence, then, with asking—and we do it with

some degree of amazement—What could have possessed those divines, that they should have been so zealous and so anxious to make this disclosure, to throw open to the eyes of a Protestant public these most shocking and disgraceful scenes, carried on within the bosom of their own Church? Certainly, if from the individual Achilli proceeds the great danger of the Roman Church; if he personally is the formidable foe, the one agent whose plots are to be undermined, and whose power is to be overthrown, they may be said to have gained a triumph; for they have undoubtedly suppressed Achilli. But the formidable foe of the Roman Church is not the individual Achilli, but the Protestant world, and how as between them and the latter party does the case issue? Without professing any particular sympathy with the proceedings of the Protestant public in the matter of Achilli, we cannot in common candour deny that they have a good defence to make. The news is brought to them one day of the conversion of a distinguished Roman Catholic divine to Protestantism. As they never heard his name before, they cannot be supposed to know anything about his private life and character. All they know is, that he has held places of honour and responsibility in his own communion. Is it not natural that such a convert should be welcomed, and made much of?—that, according to the fashion of the day, he should be encouraged to appear on platforms, write pamphlets, and exhibit his testimony in every possible shape? Who can find fault with a religious party for hailing an accession from the ranks of the foe, and making every use of him? But in a little while charges are brought against the moral character of the new ally, and he is alleged to have lived a profligate life. What course does the party that has welcomed him then take? They compel him to meet these charges in a court of law, and on his failing to refute the evidence for his guilt, they give up all connexion with him, in spite of the shield which judge and jury have thrown over him. The Protestant party then might certainly have shown more caution and dignity, and abstained from parading a new convert before time and further acquaintance had proved him; but no moral offence is attributable to it. On the other hand, the Roman Church has to account for her treatment of, and conduct to, this man, while he was living this immoral life, and while she knew what his character was. She has to account not only for indulgence to, but for the positive promotion to dignities and important spiritual cures, of a known and proved profligate. She has to account for gross laxity of discipline, and indifference to plain moral considerations. As between Achilli and the Church of Rome, then, the issue of this trial is favourable enough to the latter party; but as between

the Church of Rome and the Protestant public, that issue has been anything but favourable to her. It may be said that the discovery that a convert to Protestantism is an immoral man is itself a point gained, and justifies the taunt,—‘See what sort of stuff your converts are made of.’ But the other side may say that an individual instance does not prove much, and that all parties are liable to the reproach of unworthy members. If immoral men have become converts to Protestantism, immoral men have also become converts to Rome. The accession of an immoral convert is indeed an unpleasant fact to the party he has joined. But what is the scandal of such a fact—one which burdens the party affected by it with no real responsibility whatever, (for who could have prevented it?)—compared with that of a definite course of proceeding pursued by a body, which could have acted otherwise, and is therefore strictly responsible for such conduct;—with the scandal of gross laxity, the deliberate patronage and promotion of a known immoral man, the appointment to a succession of spiritual cures of the most tender and trying kind, of a priest against whom their own spiritual courts, secret though they were, had but just proved and recorded abominable offences. What is there in the indiscretion of prematurely parading a new and unknown convert, compared with the moral guilt of this connivance at, this encouragement of vice? We have for our own part no concern with Achilli one way or another. He did not join the Church of England. But that candour, to which even such opponents in theology as Lord Shaftesbury and Sir Cullen Eardly have a right at our hands, obliges us to state clearly the impression which this case has left upon us.

We naturally ask then, with some surprise, what could have induced the divines of the Roman Church to press forward this disclosure so zealously as they have? One would suppose, from the tone which they have adopted, that they had shown us some marvellously bright and perfect system in operation. But the minds of controversialists generally, and especially theological ones, are—happily for their own inward comfort and self-complacency, though not, perhaps, to their credit or real influence as arguers—so constructed that they only see that side of a matter which is favourable to them, and forget the other. The Romanist divines have been so absorbed in the halloo and pursuit of an antagonist, that they have forgotten their own defences; so occupied in exposing another that they have not seen that they were exposing themselves at the same time, disclosing the corruptions and weaknesses of their own system. Had they realized this we cannot but think that their tone would have been a more modified one. And we will apply this remark

especially to the piece of rhetoric which was the immediate cause of this trial. That the inner tone of—we grieve to be obliged to call it—fierce exultation which pervades Dr. Newman's address to Achilli applied to that person individually, we should be the last to believe, because we could not believe this without thinking worse of Dr. Newman than of Achilli himself; for no one can exult over a fallen brother without himself in the very act falling lower. The exultation which marks the passage was not over Achilli, but over the Protestant public by whom Achilli had been brought forward and paraded. Had Dr. Newman, however, reflected how much more his own Church had had to do with Achilli than the Protestant public had; how much more she was implicated in a guilt which her own connivance had fostered, he would, we venture to think, have subdued that triumph.

The impression which a first view leaves upon the mind, as regards the bearings of this case on the Roman Church, is not weakened, but confirmed, when we come to a more accurate inspection. And we will premise with saying, that, whatever statements we put forward in this article respecting Achilli, we do not put forward as our own, but simply as the statements, true or false, of the Roman Catholic party.

The year 1826 finds Achilli a Dominican monk, an ordained priest, and professor of philosophy at the Seminary or College of Viterbo, a city in the Papal States, about forty miles from Rome. As yet no charges have been brought against him, but he bears the reputation of an able and eloquent young divine, a rising ecclesiastic. But gradually the cloud gathers: in the course of five or six years charges begin to spread against him; the Rev. Joseph Giotti testifying that he had by that time acquired a bad reputation. In the year 1833 proceedings were instituted against him in the Bishop's Court at Viterbo for two different offences, the miserable details of one of which were given in the recent trial before the Queen's Bench. A third was shortly added. The Court sentenced him to 'a deprivation of his faculties:' but the sentence was not very efficient. He left Viterbo, and went to Rome; at which place, to use Sir A. Cockburn's words, 'having strong friends,' he was able to defeat justice, and 'the affair was hushed up.'

But the suppression of justice is a small part of that line of proceeding for which the Church of Rome stands responsible in this matter. It might have been expected indeed that the authorities would have been content to have stopped here: it was a sufficiently bold indulgence to such definite and gross crimes. But they proceeded further, and immediately conferred upon him a most important and responsible office, that

of Prefect of Studies and Head Professor of the College of Minerva at Rome, a magnificent ecclesiastical seminary. He was, moreover, as if the authorities considered that a notorious criminal was specially suited to the task of reforming and correcting the faults of others, and was likely to be a patron of that sound discipline which he had so much deserved, and so little experienced,—appointed to accompany the Provincial of the Dominican Order in the Roman States on a Visitation tour, as his adviser and *amicus curiæ*. The writer of an article in the Dublin Review of June, 1850, does indeed try to ward off from the Roman Church the disgrace of this appointment, by showing that it was not that kind of appointment which Achilli had described it to be. But he fails in his effort. Achilli may have exaggerated his office, and have been guilty of a misstatement in describing himself as on this occasion ‘Visitor’ of the Dominicans. But the fact is clear that he went on a Visitation tour, and was a companion of the Provincial and Visitor throughout it, and apparently an official and confidential one.

But honours descend thick upon Achilli. A higher and more spiritual office than that even of a professor of an ecclesiastical seminary, or a visitor of an ecclesiastical order, awaits him. The task of the Lent preacher is an especially apostolic one, requiring all the zeal and fervour of an exalted piety. He has to come into the most intimate contact with the heart, and stir up from the lowest depths the religious affections and convictions of a Christian congregation. He has to awaken the dull and lethargic, to soften the obdurate, to calm and soothe the sensitive and timorous soul. The most awful and the most tender labours are entrusted to him; and he is the shepherd of the spiritual flock at the most trying and solemn season of the Church’s year. Even the most lax authorities might have been expected to pause, before they conferred such an office on a man fresh from a trial in an ecclesiastical court, at which the worst offences had been proved against him. But the Roman authorities are bold. At the commencement of 1835, hardly more than a year after the proof of his guilt had been recorded, he received from the Cardinal Archbishop of Capua an invitation to preach the Lent sermons, in the Cathedral, and in the Collegiate Church of S. Maria di Capua, of that city.—The invitation he accepts, receiving together with it a natural appendage to such an office, the authority to hear confessions. Proceeding from Capua to Naples, a new post awaits his acceptance in the latter city. He is appointed Prior of the Convent of S. Peter Martyr. These appointments bring him into the most intimate and delicate connexion with both sexes; they give him, to quote the article just alluded to, ‘access to establishments of female

education,' and to the management and superintendence of 'pious associations of men and women.' Considering the peculiar offences of which he had been guilty, therefore, they are just the appointments which it was most indecent to entrust to him. What wonder if such an official—we quote our contemporary again—'made use of the facilities which his religious character gave him;' if he established a *Pia Unione* of both sexes at Naples, of which one of the fruits was the seduction of a young female member?

We naturally ask, after such facts have been stated, what could have occasioned such appointments; what could have justified them in any way to the minds of those who made them; what excuse there could have been; whether it was possible that the misdemeanours of the promoted ecclesiastic had not reached their ears, so that they promoted him in ignorance of his real character? We look for such circumstances of palliation, but look in vain. Viterbo is about forty miles from Rome. A sentence, therefore, passed in an ecclesiastical court at Viterbo, could hardly have not reached Rome; and besides, the affair, we are told, was 'hushed up' at the latter place: it was therefore known to begin with. The appointment then of Achilli to the professorship in the College of Minerva, was made in the full knowledge of what his character was, and what offences he had recently committed. Again, Capua is something more than a hundred miles on the other side of Rome to Viterbo; so that Viterbo and Capua are about as distant from each other as London and Exeter. It is true, indeed, there were neither then, nor are now, railroads which connect this trio of cities together; nor probably were the coaches between them first rate. Nor probably did the post convey letters from the most northern to the most southern of these cities in the course of the night. Still Viterbo (Rome, we need not say) and Capua are considerable towns. There are regular roads, and there is a regular system of travelling from one to the other. There is also a post which conveys letters—we will hazard the assertion—in three or four days from one to the other of these towns. It would then, we presume, be known at Viterbo that Achilli was preaching the Lent course of sermons at Capua. Now we are told that, at Viterbo, Achilli had a wide scandalous reputation, and also that he was formally condemned in the episcopal court there. When the appointment then of Achilli to the Lent preachership at Capua was made public, was there no one at Viterbo to inform the Cardinal Archbishop of the condition in which his nominee stood as to character? If the secret ecclesiastical tribunal could not speak, or confide even to a princely ecclesiastic its formal record, was

there no one in the whole of Viterbo to write a letter by post to the Archbishop of Capua, to tell what the real fact was. Where were all the pious priests, professors, students of Viterbo, that they could witness the scandal of such a delinquent assuming the spiritual mien, and pretending to awaken consciences, and terrify lethargic sinners,—and do and say nothing? What a mockery of every thing sacred to be seen with unconcern—the affecting appeal, the rousing warning, the eye raised to heaven, the hand waved in energy and emotion, the voice rolling in thunder or softened to a whisper, to express judgment or mercy, the loud summary call to the profligate, the profane, the sensual, to give up their dream of pleasure and turn to God,—the text, urged with apostolic vehemence, ‘Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead’—all this exhibition proceeding from a hardened offender, who had just come out of an ecclesiastical court. We cannot suppose, then, that Capua remained in ignorance of Achilli’s character. The same observations may be applied to the appointment to the Priory of the Monastery at Naples. Naples is about five-and-twenty miles from Capua—an addition, but not a formidable one to the line of posts which connect Viterbo with the scenes of Achilli’s promotion. Intelligence of the appointment at Naples then would, we presume, reach Viterbo; intelligence of the offences at Viterbo would reach Naples.

There is one explanation, indeed, of such an employment of patronage, which deserves notice for its originality, though it cannot be said to satisfy the demands of a rigorous inquirer, or solve the difficulties of an intelligent one. The writer of the article in our contemporary, to which we have referred, accounts for these promotions on the idea that they were conferred with the intention of ‘reclaiming’ the offender. ‘This good man,’ is his remark, alluding to M. Brochetti, the Provincial of the Dominicans, ‘wishing to *reclaim*, if possible, Achilli, and to show how he believed him to be sincerely penitent, took him with him on his tour of visitation.’ ‘He was unhappily,’ our contemporary adds, a few pages after, ‘appointed prior of a convent in Naples, *always in the hope of reclaiming him.*’ These important and honourable posts then, that of conducting, with the Provincial of his Order, a visitation tour, and that of the Headship of a religious house, were conferred upon him with the view of correcting his vices and softening his heart. For the same reason, we presume, he was also appointed to the Professorship of the college of Minerva at Rome, and to the office of Lent preacher in Capua. Now we cannot hope to vie with our Romanist contemporary in the knowledge of the true principles of penance, and therefore we may easily be mistaken on such

a subject: still we must confess that this is the first time we ever heard that the proper method of reclaiming a criminal, was to give him a comfortable and lucrative post in which to repose after his misdemeanour. To us, who are not in the secret on this subject, such a consequence looks much more like a reward than a punishment. Nor should we advise that such a judicial plan should be divulged; for it would certainly lead to the increase of crime even more than absolute impunity. The common supposition has always been that evil actions deserve shame and privation. But here, the criminal, instead of meeting shame and privation, is promoted to a succession of offices which gratify his ambition and comfortably replenish his purse. He is even specially singled out for the task of reforming others, and promoting and enforcing that spiritual discipline of which he has been himself the most signal infringer. Is this the way to soften the heart and correct the morals of an offender, or is it the way to harden and dull him; to make him suppose that the religious society to which he belongs does not care much for what he has done, and that his offences have been, after all, only the natural results of his calling, with its peculiar restriction and consequent temptations, and were a sort of matter of course?

It may be said, however,—though the defence would not go to show that such a treatment of crime was justifiable, but only to show that some atonement was ultimately made for it, allowing it to be scandalous—it may be said that Achilli was at last brought to trial, and received from the tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome the punishment due to his offences. We say the tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome, for we cannot suppose that the sentence of the episcopal court of Viterbo, earlier in his career, will be adduced. That sentence was plainly ineffective, and was ridden over. It was not allowed the virtue of a judicial sentence, and therefore we shall not count it. But to this defence, partial as it may be, we have some exceptions to make.

In the first place, then, we must remark, that this trial did not take place, this sentence was not pronounced till the criminal's course of guilt and profligacy had reached its tenth year. This is at any rate tardy justice: the year 1831 marked Achilli a criminal; the year 1841 records the sentence of the Inquisition upon him. In the interval between these two dates he pursues his immoral career unchecked, nor unchecked only, but honoured and promoted. For ten years he has the run of the Church's field, he has all the facilities that responsible station can put into his hands for effecting his bad purposes, and he takes ample advantage of them.

But, in the next place, safely as we might concede the small merit of so dilatory a justice to the Roman Church, an attentive survey of the facts of the case forbids us to suppose that even such justice was the consequence of any intrinsic and hearty disgust at immorality, and sympathy with the wrongs of an injured flock. It appears rather to have been a concession, so far as it took place upon the moral ground at all—to a long and wide accumulation of scandal, which could not any longer be resisted. There is a certain growth of crime which, under the worst and laxest judicial systems, must be noticed, and the most cowed and callous public opinion will point out at last an offender with a decision that cannot safely be despised. Some scandal appears to have accompanied Achilli's career from the first. A witness informs us that his reputation was bad at Viterbo. This sense of scandal indeed cannot have been a very potent and indignant one, otherwise it would have compelled an earlier notice of, and obedience to it, than a sentence in the year 1841. But even a weak sense of scandal grows into a strong one if the provocation to it accumulates; and by the end of ten years Achilli seems to have become sufficiently notorious to make it almost unsafe to leave him any longer untouched. He was noticed in the reports of the police as a person who was corrupting the public morals. Indeed, even the residuum of merit, whatever it may be, which the Roman courts may claim, after the deductions we have made, does not appear wholly to belong to them, but to be shared, and that in the greater proportion, by the police. Strange as it may appear, under a system which grudges the State any control whatever over members of the priestly order, even if guilty of civil crimes, and would make all justice in their case ecclesiastical; the secular police seem to have been the prime movers in the matter of bringing Achilli to justice. In the first proceeding against him at Viterbo, the police come forward, though not as prime movers,—for it does not appear which party moved first, the ecclesiastical or the civil,—still, as movers, and authoritative ones. The head of the police in that city put him into his official report—a report from which the writer of the article in our contemporary professes to have 'derived his information' respecting Achilli's conduct in that place. But the conclusive proceedings against him, at the tribunal of the Inquisition, are preceded by a very definite and strong act of the police. 'The Neapolitan authorities,' we quote from the same article an official despatch, with the sight of which the writer had been favoured, 'having satisfied themselves 'with the truth of the charge' [we need not mention what sort of charge], 'took measures for the removal of the delinquent 'friar. This was effected on the 8th of September, 1840. But

'instead of proceeding to the convent assigned to him, he went to a relation's house, whence he returned stealthily to Naples, only to be expelled thence a second time, on the 21st of February, 1841.' 'Be it remembered,' adds our contemporary, 'that it is not the Inquisition that here speaks, nor is it any ecclesiastical, nor is it any Roman tribunal. It is the police of another kingdom.' The Neapolitan police, then, heard the charge which the indignant father brought against the delinquent friar; the Neapolitan police punished the delinquent. But where were the ecclesiastical authorities all this time? where was the episcopal court? 'The history of our Achilli's sojourn at Naples,' says our contemporary, 'was that of a man hiding himself from the observation of the police.' But why should he hide himself from the observation of the police especially? why did this discreet, if not commendable fear, not extend also to the ecclesiastics of Naples? Were the interests of morality less dear to the Church than to the State? Are police officers the natural correctors of priests? Such appears, however, to have been their position at Naples. It is when a priest has been long under the eye of the police, has been inscribed as a black sheep in their reports, and has actually been expelled from the city, that the Roman ecclesiastical court at last takes him to task. The act of the police dates in the February, and the act of the Roman ecclesiastical court dates in the June of 1841.

But a further reduction must be made. It does not appear that even now the moral ground was at all the principal one on which the Ecclesiastical Court stepped forward in Achilli's case. The Court of the Inquisition has been popularly regarded in this country as a tribunal taking cognizance of doctrinal offences only. It appears from the evidence of a Roman Catholic Bishop, Dr. Grant, that it takes cognizance of moral offences also, and the document which was produced in evidence at the late trial before the Queen's Bench, under the signature of the Notary of that Court, certainly makes mention of moral offences. Still we can hardly be wrong in supposing that the Court of the Inquisition is a Court designed for the preservation and guardianship of doctrine principally, and taking cognizance mainly of doctrinal offences. Now the Court which condemned Achilli was the Court of the Inquisition. It is difficult upon the mere fact of the selection of such a court to try him, to avoid the conjecture that some questions of doctrine mixed with those of morals in Achilli's case, and that the former had at least some share in exciting ecclesiastical justice to a sense of its duty.

But we are not left to conjectural inference here. It is confessed by our contemporary that Achilli was arraigned on the

charge of heresy, together with that of immorality. 'It is true,' he says, speaking of the period preceding his trial at the Inquisition, 'that Achilli about this period did begin, if covertly he had not begun before, to speak against faith, and not only against faith, but also against morals; that his language became scandalous, that he perverted others, and that to him was attributed the sad fall, in morals first, and then in faith, of F. Desanctis, a priest of the order of S. Camillus, now in Malta, whither we believe he bore him the partner of his guilt. We have no wish to conceal Achilli's lurking heterodoxy, because we believe it to be in him, as in most apostates, a natural result; corrupt morals necessarily beget a corrupt faith. . . . Achilli therefore was by this time either virtually or in thought, in desire, in wish, perhaps even in intention, no longer a Catholic. And therefore he is acknowledged to have been and to continue a Protestant—a Protestant of five years' standing. . . . Such being the case it is no wonder that he got into troubles with the Inquisition, before which he was summoned in 1841. He was arraigned for his unsound principles, not merely held but openly expressed, in regard to morals and to faith. But he was arraigned also for his gross immoralities from the beginning, including those committed in Capua.'

We may safely leave it to the reader, upon this extract, to form his own conclusion as to the share which the doctrinal and the moral grounds respectively had in the trial of Achilli. It states that he had begun to speak against the faith, also to speak against morals; that he had ceased to be a Catholic, and had become a Protestant in heart: that 'such being the case it was no wonder that he got into troubles with the Inquisition.' Here is an alternation of the moral and the doctrinal ground; but which takes the precedence? If the moral, why is it not first of all said that Achilli was brought before the Inquisition to answer for his immoral conduct? Why, when he had been engaged for ten years in a course of licentious *acts*, is he arraigned in the first instance for his words—for *speaking* against faith and morals? What is this 'speaking against morals,' which is forsooth so much greater an offence than acting against them? Certainly, the systematic defence of immorality would ordinarily show a worse heart than immoral conduct alone would; but as showing this, why not have included it in one first and foremost charge against him of immorality, instead of dividing the two and subordinating both to a charge of speaking against the faith. With such appearances, we shall beg leave to consider, until proof appears to the contrary, that the charge which mainly and principally brought Achilli before the Inquisition was a charge of heresy; though when

the heretic already stood before the tribunal, his immoralities obtained a glad notice as the accompaniments of heterodoxy, even if they got none upon their own intrinsic ground. Looking at the facts of the case from the first, it does certainly appear to us far from certain, that had Achilli abstained from the crowning act of heresy, the Court would have given itself the trouble to investigate his morals. He goes on for years in a licentious course, and is not degraded or even reprimanded; he retains his emoluments, his spiritual rank; it is only when he is discovered to be heterodox, that he is brought to judgment: morals may be connived at, but heresy is unpardonable.

And on this subject we cannot but make the remark, that it would have been more satisfactory had the defendant's side, in the late trial before the Queen's Bench, allowed the whole of the record of the proceedings before the Inquisition to have appeared before the Court, instead of a partial description of it drawn up by the notary; all the counts on which Achilli was arraigned, instead of a selection from them. A selection made by an individual officer of the tribunal, upon instructions received from a party in this country, leaves a residue behind the scenes, of which perfect openness and fairness feel the absence. Nor is it easy to avoid the conjecture, that had the record of the tribunal been allowed to appear whole, or a whole description of it to be given, the charge of heresy would have been seen occupying an inconvenient precedence in it. 'We cannot indeed,' as Sir A. Cockburn justly observes, 'dictate to continental Courts in what form they should draw up their judgments,' but we may fairly require, that however roughly these may be drawn up, the notary who gives us the description of them, should describe the whole of them and not a part. It is certain, from the admissions of the other side, that there were counts against Achilli, at this trial, besides those relating to his immorality. But these latter counts are the only ones allowed to appear in the document produced before the Queen's Bench.

We will take leave of this part of our subject with one remark; and that is, that however solemn the sentence which this tribunal may have passed on Achilli, and whatever the grounds on which it was passed, there is nothing to make us suppose, that it would have been much more lasting or efficient than that of the Court of Viterbo, had Achilli remained in the Roman Church. There is nothing to show that the profession of orthodoxy, a nominal adherence, and a readiness to give his Church the benefit of his eloquence and talents, would not have negatived the effects of the last trial, as they did that of the first, and Achilli have been seen in a short time going on much the same as before, preaching Lent sermons, and presiding over monastic and collegiate

bodies. His conversion to Protestantism has at any rate precluded this result, and left the judgment of the Roman Court in fossil permanency and force, unshaken but untried.

We have now another task to perform, and that is, to give our own explanation of these facts—this course of connivance and promotion which we have been contemplating. It will not pretend to the certainty of demonstration, but it will at any rate equal in force and probability the explanation which our contemporary has attempted,—in assigning for the motives of this indulgence, the pious design of ‘reclaiming’ the unhappy offender who was the recipient of it.

Examining these facts upon the principles of common sense, we feel it difficult to arrive at any other conclusion than this: that where immoral acts of a certain class, committed again and again by the member of a priesthood and an order, and known to be committed by him, do not prevent him from receiving promotion to lucrative and high offices, and responsible and spiritual cures, there that class of offences is not regarded substantially as being weighty and heinous. Whether this arises from defective appreciation of the sin itself, or from an indulgence to the peculiar circumstances and temptations of the offender, or from both, the result which is forced upon us is the same—viz. that the sin is substantially not thought much of; that it is regarded as a slip, a peccadillo, not as a serious sin. We do not say that this is the view of the stricter minds, but that it is the view of those who practically represent and administer the system. And for such a view we see some causes in operation in the Roman system, very deserving of attention, if we desire an explanation of that state of things which the recent trial before the Queen’s Bench has placed before us.

The question of celibacy, its merits and its advantages, as compared with those of married life, is too delicate and large a one to be entered upon incidentally and suddenly. But one observation relating to this question shall be made, because it has a very special and direct bearing upon the particular case before us. The observation we shall make, relates to the temper, age, and circumstances in which such a state should be embraced, if it is embraced at all, and the source from which we shall draw it will be the text of Scripture itself. The passages of Scripture directly bearing on the question of celibacy, are, we need not say, few: they are mainly two, one in the 19th chapter of S. Matthew, and one in the 7th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians. The language in the former passage is this—‘All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given . . . He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.’ The language of the latter is, ‘I would that all men were even as

‘I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. . . . Concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. I suppose therefore that this is good for the present distress, I say, that it is good for a man so to be. . . . He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife. . . . And this I speak for your own profit; not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely, and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction. . . . He that standeth steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart to keep his virgin, doeth well.’ Now these passages speak first of the unmarried state itself, and secondly, of the qualification for entering into and embracing it. The unmarried state is spoken of as in itself a superior state to the married, and possessing greater advantages for spiritual improvement and the worship of God. The qualification for embracing this state, is the possession of a particular gift of God—a gift not given to all, but only to a select number. And the sign of the possession of this gift is described as a certain state and temper of mind, a strength and resolution, of which the individual himself is conscious, and at the consciousness of which he arrives after serious and sober examination of himself. No language could describe more strongly than S. Paul’s, the solid proof which a man ought to have of his capacities, and the search he ought to have instituted into his own heart, before he ventures upon such a trial. He must be as sure as the nature of such proof allows, that he is steadfast in his heart, has no necessity, hath power over his own will, hath decreed in his heart. These are forcible words. It would be ridiculous to suppose that mere boys could look so searchingly into their own hearts, and attain such a knowledge of themselves. Self-knowledge is not so early an acquisition. Such a search obviously implies that the person making it has arrived at full years of discretion, and is of mature understanding; that he is able to doubt himself, to mistrust temporary emotion, and wait for more solid symptoms. Certain powers and a certain temper, a coolness, a sobriety, a due mistrust, which manhood alone possesses, are implied.

But what is the practice of the Roman Church on this subject? Are not whole masses admitted into the profession of celibacy, before they can possibly know anything about their own strength or weakness? Are not crowds of mere boys systematically driven into it, before their tender unformed minds can have

ever directed one real look into themselves? The Council of Trent lays down the age of sixteen as a sufficiently mature one for a *profession*, or the inexorable taking of a vow of celibacy. Now, will any impartial sensible man, who is acquainted with the facts of mental growth, and has observed at what time the human being arrives at maturity,—will any father of a family, any tutor, come forward and declare that he thinks a youth of sixteen is able solidly to acquaint himself with his own capacities, and carry on a cool and grave search into himself?—that he is able to arrive upon satisfactory data at the sober conviction that he is steadfast in his heart, has no necessity, hath power over his own will? can he be reasonably certain of the decrees of his own heart? Is it then according to the rule of Scripture that a youth should, at the age of sixteen, be sent into this state, and placed in a situation of peculiar temptation without the power of withdrawing from it, for the rest of his life? But the assignment of a regular profession, or taking of the vow, to the age of sixteen, only affects the act of profession itself, and therefore only guards the formal and technical entrance into the state of celibacy. Under the Roman system, the youth is practically handed over to that state long before he is formally admitted to it. He is put at a very early age, while a mere child, into a train which ultimately carries him to the act of profession, a result which he cannot prevent, unless he is endowed with an independence and power of mind which children have not, nor indeed ought to have. How is a mere child to be expected to oppose the designs of his parents, who bring him up to be a priest or a monk as a mode of livelihood? How can he possibly lift himself out of the circumstances which surround and control him? He must take what line of education is offered him, or have no education at all. How can he be expected to know, or to think of, the result at all, or find out his objection in the first instance? As a matter of course he finds himself in a train of education for being a monk; as a matter of course he takes the vows when he is told to do so. It may be proper to add, that the assumption of ‘the religious habit,’ which is an incipient act of profession, though not attended by the vow, is allowed by the Council of Trent to take place, in the case of girls, at the age of twelve; and that this permission is construed by many, as Thomassinus informs us, to extend to children of the other sex as well. We have no means at present of ascertaining what is the practice of the Church of Rome in this respect, nor is the distinction one of much importance. Practically the religious habit is imposed, when the boy is put into a regular train of education for being a monk. The Council of Trent may lay down formal rules against enforcing

or enticing children, but can such rules prevent the natural working of a system? Can they prevent friends and relations, at the persuasion of the priest, or as a means of getting a burden off their hands, or for the more creditable object of securing a provision for the child himself, putting the child into training for the monastic life; and can they make the child know of the existence of such rules, or give him the power to take advantage of them? It is ludicrous to suppose that they can. These rules, then, exist on paper; they are very convenient to refer to and parade when a charge is brought; but it is a mockery of common sense to pretend that they can be any solid safeguard against the exertion of a complete practical control over a child, in the matter of choosing this profession of life for him. Indeed it must be observed, that the principal authorities of the Roman Church hardly disclaim this result, or rather positively approve of it. The whole discussion in Thomassinus implies that it is a very good thing to dedicate children from the earliest years to a monastic life; and eminent casuists, of whom one, Medina, was himself present at the Council of Trent, interpret the restrictions of the Council in favour of allowing not only a parental dedication of children, but the reception of them within the monastic walls themselves, before the age of reason; though it is allowed that a licence from Rome is necessary in this case. It is admitted indeed by these casuists that children are no longer *obliged* now, as they were in the middle ages, by the laws of Church or State, to ratify the parental dedication by taking the vows themselves, but they add that they ought, and would be expected so to do.

The prevailing sentiment, then, in the Roman Church, is in favour of beginning the monastic life in childhood before the age of reason. Under the influence of this general idea children are brought up and put into training for that life, while they are no more than children. And finally, the inexorable vow is taken by them at an age when, if they are no longer children, they are certainly not men,—at the boyish age of sixteen.

The practical treatment of this subject by the Church of Rome, thus—independently of the question of vows, which is a distinct question, and into which we do not here enter—expressly contradicts the treatment of it in Scripture; and whereas Scripture describes the qualification for the state of celibacy as a special gift of God, not given to all; in Roman practice, on the contrary, it is regarded simply as a power, which any Christian whatever has; and its possession is counted on in the case of any chance person, picked up out of the mass, with the same confidence with which the ordinary faculties, moral and intellectual, are counted on. It is treated

as a mere matter of education, as if youth could be brought by education to the true celibate frame, just as they are brought by education to the power of reading and writing. It is quite true, that up to a certain point, we have the full right to reckon up an individual's possession of moral and religious powers; and it is that right which justifies us in bringing up any man whatever to be a Christian, notwithstanding the trials and responsibilities of the Christian state. But those moral and religious powers which we have a right to reckon on, are those which enable a man to lead an ordinary Christian life, and those only. We know that to every baptized person these powers are guaranteed, and therefore we have a right to educate any baptized person for the ordinary Christian trial. The case is altered when the trial which is contemplated is an extraordinary one, and when no guarantee exists for powers and gifts capable of surmounting it. If we commit any chance person to such a trial, we do it upon our own responsibility, notwithstanding any training which we may give him; and if he fails, and falls into greater sin thereby, we share his guilt. But the Roman Church does commit chance persons to this extraordinary trial. She commits them to it at an age, when she cannot possibly know whether they have the special gift or not. The Gospel treats the trial as one for individuals here and there to encounter, she regards it as a trial for the mass; for a chance pick out of the mass is on the same level with the mass. The Gospel prescribes to the individual a searching examination of himself, in order to ascertain the presence of this gift; the Roman Church practically requires no self-examination at all, for she commits him irrevocably to the trial, before he has the power to make it.

But we shall be told, that we do not calculate sufficiently on the grace of the new dispensation, and the powers of a renewed nature. We hear somebody saying,—You talk like a pagan. This trial is indeed too difficult for the natural man, but the Holy Spirit enables the members of the Church to meet this, and much greater. We have already answered this plea. We can know no more about the grace of the new dispensation and its operation in members of the Church, than what the Bible tells us. And the Bible expressly says, that this grace does not include the gift in question; this gift being a special one, given to some, and not to other members of the Church.

Now observe the natural results of a system which thus contradicts the rule and counsel of Scripture on this subject. The first result is, that many fail in the trial to which they are so unwarrantably exposed. The next is, that discipline is obliged to relax, and lower its estimate of the sin. Too many fall, to

enable ecclesiastical authority to exercise primitive severity toward the offenders; for the standard which the Court takes must always depend considerably on the practice of the people. The law cannot afford to have too many transgressors, and must shut its eyes. From connivance to promotion the step is short. The man's formal position is not touched; his own ambition, his serviceableness to the body, his talents, eloquence, knowledge, if he possesses them, remain. He is made use of for carrying on the system, and the system gives him his wages.

Such is the picture which the late trial before the Queen's Bench has placed before our eyes. It is very hard to suppose, judging by ordinary rules, that the long toleration and promotion of a man, known to have the character which Achilli had, could have gone on, if that class of offences had not lost, in the priestly and monastic order, that rarity which keeps up the standard of their guilt. Imagine it to be a rare, a most extraordinary thing for a cleric to commit such a crime: and that one day it is discovered that a particular cleric has plunged into the deepest crimes of this sort: would there not be something unaccountable in the immediate promotion of such a man to preside over ecclesiastical seminaries, and preach Lent sermons? The converse then approves itself, and is required to satisfy that want which we feel, as rational creatures, for some consistent account of the facts which come before us. He was promoted, because the estimate of his offence was not a high one: and the estimate was not high, because the offence itself was not sufficiently rare. A whole state of things is before us, which is perfectly intelligible upon this supposition, but which without it is not intelligible.

It is true, cases like that of Achilli do not turn up every day. But we cannot argue from the fact that they do not come out, to the fact that they do not happen. Should we, for example, but for the single circumstance that Achilli had turned Protestant, have ever heard one single word of the enormities of this particular person, Achilli? To us it appears very evident we should not. They would have been inscribed in the register of the Episcopal Court of Viterbo, in the register of the Holy Office at Rome; they would have occupied the reports of the police: but the registers of Italian Church Courts, and the reports of Italian police are not public documents. Who in this country would have been a bit the wiser for information contained in these occult rolls of parchment and secret ledgers? Achilli was in bad odour again in society; but the bad odour which surrounds a man is after all often a very limited one. A particular circle knows certain things against him; but out of this circle these facts do not transpire. By cases of immorality

coming out, we mean their coming out so as to be known to the world at large;—those of Achilli would have never come out in this sense, would never have reached Protestant ears, had he not turned Protestant. Then, Viterbo, Rome, Capua, Naples, which had been all so silent hitherto, could speak out; the police could supply, upon solicitation, useful extracts from their black book to appear in our contemporary, the ‘*Dublin*.’ The bad odour in which Achilli had lived could then be wafted across the sea. The Holy Office could send a voice from its caverns, and anybody and everybody that knew anything against the heretic could communicate it to the English press. But where was all this information before? Where it would have remained for ever after, had not Achilli become a convert,—in the confinement of official parchment, and the narrow circle of towns-talk? We cannot argue then from the fact that such cases do not come out and reach Protestant ears, to the fact that they do not occur. Of course, such cases are kept snug, are confined to the friendly knowledge of members of the communion. It is not to be expected that one religion should communicate its own scandals for the triumph of another. We observe in the evidence of some of the witnesses at the recent trial, sufficient proof of a systematic concealment of priestly scandals. A witness on being asked by the counsel whether she had told her own mother of her fall, replies, ‘No, because the Confessor forbade my mentioning it, as Achilli was an ecclesiastic.’ The concealment was used toward her own dearest and nearest relation; and the reason for it was not natural shame and remorse, but the religious duty of hiding the immorality of a priest. And where such a course is urged by a Priesthood as a religious duty upon the people, it is not difficult to guess on what a large scale concealment may take place. A double wall of concealment thus hides the misdemeanours of the priestly body from the eyes of the world at large. There is a cover at the fountain-head, and if they penetrate through this, they only ordinarily find their way into an inner and home circle of ears—a local sphere, the scandal of which never reaches the great world. But individual cases may let out a whole state of things.

There is only one answer we can think of to these observations, viz. that immorality in priests alienates them in heart from their own communion, and leads to their conversion to Protestantism; so that the fact which occasions the publication of such crimes, and therefore the publication itself, is coextensive with their occurrence. But will the assertion be seriously made, that immorality and conversion do thus go together. If it is, all we can say is, that it does not deserve serious notice;

it is an assertion and no more; and it is in violent contradiction to numerous disclosures mediæval and modern.

Will it be objected that this is an invidious line of remark, and that we are wanting to make out as bad a case as possible for the Roman Church, and squeezing out by inference what we cannot obtain by regular evidence? We answer—Here is a case before us. We did not go to look for it; it has been obtruded upon our eyes; but coming as it does before us, we must and ought to have some view or other about it. It is no little matter: it is an important and weighty disclosure of some of the interior of a system of which we are generally obliged to be external spectators only; it is one of those large facts which support an argument. Nor does it by any means stand alone; but it is a type of a regular class of discoveries which time after time take place respecting the Roman system and its working. No one, indeed, can look at all the circumstances of Achilli's case, and really suppose it to be a single case.

We shall end with two cautions to the Romanist party, as regards their language about individuals, and about their own system; cautions which this whole discussion has very naturally suggested.

First, with respect to the individual Achilli, and such like offenders, our Romanist friends call them 'wolves.' They are very free in the use of this term: it is their account of them: they are 'wolves,' and that is all that is to be said. The Roman Catholic Editor of the Report before us appends to his labours a motto from S. Augustine:—'Let not the sheep discard their clothing, because the wolf sometimes conceals himself therein.' Now this is a true account in part, but it is only a part of the truth; and we shall not allow it to pass without supplying it with its proper complement. The wolf Achilli 'concealed himself in sheep's clothing:'—granted: but when did he conceal himself therein? At the age of seventeen. At that early age he took the inexorable vow, assumed the monastic habit, and committed himself once and for all to an extraordinary state of life, and extraordinary trials. Can the first step, then, and that is a most important one, in this career of concealment be properly called his own act? 'He put on,' says our contemporary, 'in innocent youth and with guileless heart, before God's altar, the holy habit, as the wedding garment of the Lamb.' But, in the name of Scripture and of reason, we ask, is 'innocent youth' the age at which such an ordeal should be imposed? Can 'an innocent youth' know himself and his own powers? can he search his own heart, and find if he is steadfast, has no necessity, has power over his own will, has effectively decreed in his own heart. Our contemporary describes with a sentimental glow the sup-

posed innocence, youth, and guilelessness of the commencing Achilli, in order that he may contrast it with the misery and guilt of the ultimate Achilli; but never was sentiment more displaced, and never did a contrast more recoil upon an arguer's head. S. Paul does not describe innocent, guileless, unsuspecting, inexperienced youth, when he describes what are the tests of being qualified for this state of life. No: he describes the inner working and self-sifting of a *man's*, a full-grown and mature man's mind. He had not before his mind, when he wrote that chapter, 'innocent youths,' committed when they could not help themselves, and when they could not know themselves, when they were little more than tools in the hands of those who controlled them to this extraordinary state of life and its unceasing ordeal. Talk of the 'wolf,' then, as much as you please; but what if the shepherds pulled in the wolf by the head and shoulders; what if, when the wolf had eaten two or three of the sheep, the shepherds gave him a comfortable kennel in the midst of the fold, 'in the hope of reclaiming him;' what if his reformation was under such circumstances slow, and he ate several more of the sheep: what if the shepherds, still bent upon a kindly reformation of the wolf, in order to melt and captivate him by an act of unqualified trust in his sincerity, send him on a commission to bring in some stray sheep; and what if the wolf concludes an affectionate appeal to these wanderers with a meal made out of some of them? In that case the fact is certainly too evident, that he is a wolf; but neither are you good shepherds. The good shepherd does not stand by while the wolf time after time devours the sheep, and reserve his indignation till the time when the wolf has taken it into his head to leap over the walls of the fold, and is off elsewhere—then, and not till then, when all the mischief has been done, and a controversial end is to be gained, with pious horror to shout, Oh, wolf! dreadful wolf! Follow the rule of the New Testament, then, we say to the Roman Catholics; cease to supply your monastic orders by entrapping 'innocent youths,' and committing them inexorably to trials, of their power to sustain which you can have no evidence; lay upon men's shoulders only such burdens as the Gospel authorizes you to lay, and lay these burdens upon the shoulders that are able to bear them, according to the best proof you can have of their strength. Do this, and then you may shout 'Wolf,' when the man fails in the trial. But do not, when you lay the burden upon unascertained strength, condemn the fallen man as a wolf, and free yourselves from all blame. Do not, when you, and not he, are the really responsible party for the undertaking of the trial, throw all the responsibility upon him when he fails in it. Do not,—when your own connivance has encouraged the repetition of

failure, till the fallen man has fallen much lower than he did at first,—throw the accumulation of blame entirely at his doors, as if you yourselves were no sharers in it. Do not do this, even in the case of the worst, the deepest criminals. Not even in the case of Achilli can we allow the breach of plain, simple justice, which is involved in parading, with the exulting precision of place and date, the catalogue of his sins, without one single thought on the premature committal of him to the trial. Never till that day comes, when the secrets of all hearts shall be made manifest, can it be known whether a deep, an incalculable wrong was not done to this man by that act of his Church. It is easy, according to superficial notions of justice, to shove aside the case of such a man, as if he could have no rights and no wrongers, and because he is now a criminal had always been an outlaw. But no one can possibly tell how far his first offence originated in his having had a, to him, unduly hard trial put upon him; how far the succeeding offences were consequences of the first, and therefore how far the whole ultimate accumulation of guilt may fall back step by step upon the original act of his Church, though not, of course, to the relief of himself from responsibility. This is a mysterious subject. All we know is that a course of sin when once begun has very soon the effect of hardening the mind, and that the beginning of sin may be a trial which ought not to have been placed upon a man. We cannot cut this matter short by saying,—The man had freewill, therefore he could have avoided the sin, therefore he was not wronged by the trial. Scripture has a larger and more complex mode of treating this subject. It treats man certainly as having freewill, but the sort of freewill which it describes is a mystery, and not a single definite power cognizable by the understanding. It is clear from Scripture that such freewill as the Gospel secures to us, is not a power of doing anything whatever of a moral or spiritual kind; because Scripture says expressly, that a man may have one gift or spiritual power, and not have another. But though it is as clear as the day that this is the view of Scripture, and though it is sufficiently clear that, if it is, Achilli was wronged in having a trial imposed upon him at an age when he could not know whether he had the corresponding gift,—not once has it occurred to the controversialists of the Roman Church to acknowledge this wrong. Yet, if a clear wrong has been done to a man, even though it be one single one, and though he himself be the vilest criminal under the sun, that wrong ought to be acknowledged; especially if it was done at a critical and telling time. Dr. Newman may say, You, Achilli, are the scandal of the Roman Church; but how can we possibly know, whether Achilli may not say with truth—yes,

and with a truth which, in spite of, nay, rather in consequence of his very sins, will be recorded in the Divine register,—You, the Church of Rome, have been an offence unto me. The Roman controversialists had, indeed, a clear right to remind Achilli that he had disqualified himself by his crimes for appearing as a witness and preacher against the Roman Church. But that right ought to have been exerted with forbearance, and under the check of the consciousness that Achilli himself had his ground of complaint, and a real one against Rome. But so far from being conscious of any wrong on their side, or being checked by it, they have, on the contrary, with the blindness of men who can see no fault in the system to which they belong, taken especial pains to urge that very point, that the vow taken at the age of seventeen did include the state of celibacy, to urge it—will it be believed?—as against Achilli, and for themselves. They have been possessed with the spirit of folly to that degree, that they have mistaken a clear argument against them for an argument in their favour, and have called the special attention of the whole world to this injustice in their system. At the late trial before the Queen's Bench, the counsel of the defendant was instructed to fix upon the vow which Achilli took at the age of seventeen, the special interpretation of a vow of celibacy. The unfortunate man himself, indeed, endeavoured to evade the force of the vow, on what principle, we confess, we are unable to see, except on the general one of denying all acts whatever that were charged upon him by the opposite side. But a witness on his own side expressly fixes this meaning upon the vow.

‘Dominico Pogge, formerly a Dominican monk, now principal of a Protestant educational establishment at Seacombe, near Liverpool, cross-examined by Sir A. Cockburn: “You were one of the Fathers?” “Yes,” “What vows did you take?” “I took the vow of obedience as a Dominican, but always thought, that though not explicitly, implicitly those of ‘poverty’ and ‘chastity’ were included. The book of Ferraris is one of authority, but there are things in it which have become obsolete.” “But this is an edition of 1783, and it states, *Tria vota, paupertatis, castitatis, et obedientie, sunt essentiae religionis ex jure divino*. Now is this so; that the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, are of the essence of the religious life?” “All that is perfectly true, according to the belief of the Church of Rome.” “So that it would be an essential part of the vow taken by a Dominican, to obey the injunction of chastity?” “Certainly.”’

The other caution which we shall give to our Romanist friends, is one on which the limits of this article will not allow us to enlarge. But we will give it in two words. It relates to their language respecting their system. Do not boast too much of the effectiveness of your system. Undoubtedly it is effective. But how is that effectiveness obtained? Is it not at the cost of a clear violation of the rule of the New Testament—that rule

which only echoes after all the voice of reason, the instincts of charity,—that no one should be committed to extraordinary trials before his strength can be ascertained? What gives your Church its effectiveness, is your system of celibacy. That system supplies you with a powerful and disposable force. But is not your practical system, nay, your formal system, as set forth by your authorities on this question of celibacy, at variance with the plain recommendations of Scripture? Do you practically regard Scripture as inspired on this question, or rather, do not you take a line of your own, quite independent of whatever Scripture may say? If so, the effectiveness of your system is not after all so enviable a one; there is a blot upon it which it cannot wipe off. When you boast of your effectiveness, your antagonists have only to go to the New Testament. They see there, as plain as words can speak, a whole different view of this question of celibacy, to that of your Church. They can feel confident that under whatever obstacles their own system may labour, it is not all right with yours. You look to effectiveness, as if that were the one object which a Christian Church ought to aim at, and as if there were no rules, no limits laid down, in Scripture or reason, by which this aim should be modified. So long as you can get your force up, whether by conscription or by guile, by whatever recruiting arts, you care not; the result is obtained: your force is collected; your system is effective. You are quite satisfied; you boast; you call the attention of the world to your success. You say—Look at us, how strong we are, how effective we are. What is the natural result of this system, proceeding upon human ideas which have thrown off the check of Scripture? Tremendous scandal. Shocking disclosures from time to time take place, which show what the interior working of such a system, in a greater or less degree, always is. What then is your reply? Oh, these scandals are necessary: we must run the risk of them, if we are to have an *effective* system. But who told you of any Divine command to be effective at all risks? We never heard of one. There is no such command. You have invented it. We allow then the effectiveness of your system, and while we allow it, we do not grudge it you too much. We think the first command to be attended to, is the commandment of charity, the rule of the Gospel. We are ready to allow that our own shortcomings may be owing to other and not so good reasons; but so far as the observance of that rule takes away from the effectiveness of our system, it is not a weakness to be ashamed of.

ART. VI.—*The Study of Words.* By the Rev. R. CHENEVIX TRENCH, B.D. London: John W. Parker.

THERE is no test by which to measure a man's state of thought, education, and intellect, so accurate as his choice of words. It may, indeed, be only a truism to assert this; but, at least, it is a truism not enough in men's thoughts, and not used as it might be as a safeguard against pretenders and shallow thinkers. For most men, if they would exert their powers of discrimination, are judges of a clear address, and are alive to the charm of nicely fitting words, well adjusted to the thought they clothe. Accurate thinkers cannot talk—much less write—in a slovenly fashion. Loose talkers cannot be accurate thinkers, and we may well mistrust the reasoner who would turn us from an established train of thought if we can detect in his own line of persuasions terms applied at random, and arguments set forth in a vague and uncertain phraseology.

That man ought to inspire no confidence who uses his words without weighing them, who attaches to them different meanings as suits his purpose, and who is so little alive to his own inaccuracies that he takes for granted his hearer follows him in all his changes, and accepts every term in the sense in which he uses it: showing himself to have no fixed unchangeable definitions in his mind, no other idea of the meaning of words than that which he assigns to them at the moment, and remaining all the while blind to the confusion and mistiness of thought, which this habit propagates and engenders. And yet how many talkers, preachers, and writers might be thus described who have made some figure in the world; how many unprofitable disputes have arisen and been maintained, at the expense of truth and charity, solely by the zealous efforts of this band of vague and yet positive thinkers!

But, happily, all inaccurate talkers do not think it necessary to give wide circulation to their errors. Our concern, taking up the subject from the volume before us, is rather with the mass of mankind who are content to talk well or ill to their own immediate circle. And whatever sphere this is, a man shows by his choice of words what fruit he has gained from the experience and education which have fallen to his share. Man's first use of language, like the first life of language itself, is of its literal simple phrases, perfectly expressive of plain wants and simple facts. Conscience keeps him, it may be, tolerably clear, in apprehension of the first abstractions that come in his way,

helping him to a notion of 'good' and 'bad' apart from his nurse's definition; but in process of time he finds himself in possession of a large vocabulary, the offspring of the world's thought, wisdom, and genius, which, as he avails himself of it, may, either guide him to the comprehension of the deepest, purest truths;—the very words themselves, if duly weighed, so many trains of thought worked ready to his hands, facilitating study and clearing the mind for still further attainments:—or, if adopted without reflection, simply lead him astray into regions beyond his powers: the habit which he thus acquires of misapplying the most delicate vehicles of thought with all their infinite shades of meaning only plunging him into deeper confusion of ideas, while at the same time it beguiles him into vanity, rash assertion, and the whole train of evils which follow upon the use of high-sounding words to which the mind cannot give substance. Avoiding this error, and still shrinking from the labour of thought, he may indeed confine himself all his days, though not by a conscious exercise of choice, to the circumscribed range of terms and symbols which satisfied his childhood, or which are forced upon him by his calling in life; but this paucity of words betrays the absence or total neglect of the higher powers of the intellect, which cannot grow without words to embody them. The man without a clear comprehension of the words he uses, and a tolerably full vocabulary, is in no proper sense educated or formed. He can neither think deeply, nor express himself forcibly, nor converse accurately, nor appeal effectually to the reason of others, nor touch their feelings. For all this, correct and expressive language is absolutely necessary: even religion must be invested with true and powerful words to be duly apprehended; while all acknowledge its influence in enlarging, refining, and elevating the language of those who have had no other teacher, so that, when roused by the occasion, the ignorant can be eloquent, and having learned sacred truths through divine words, can apply those words with convincing force and propriety.

A careful study of words, then, is one of the main helps that education can give to the intellect, and no intellect, however clear, can work without this training. For though a good understanding, unaided by formal instruction, can arrive at an accurate comprehension of that branch of language which comes within nearest reach and most familiar practice, and can use it with powerful effect, no penetration can of itself give clear insight into terms beyond this range; therefore, the deepest thinkers are always most anxious to impress upon others—not the ignorant and thoughtless only, but their most enlightened readers—the necessity of study and agreement upon the terms and

words to be used in the subject on which they are entering. Keenly discriminating themselves—feeling the force of every slight deviation of meaning—none are so alive to the danger others run of separating words from the ideas connected with them, and of the magnitude of the evils which may result from any confusion on this point. ‘Although,’ says Bacon, ‘we think we govern our words, yet certain it is that words, as a Tartar’s bow, do shoot back upon the understanding of the wisest, and mightily entangle and pervert the judgment; so as it is almost necessary in all controversies and disputations to imitate the wisdom of the mathematicians in setting down in the very beginning the definitions of the words and terms, that others may know how we accept and understand them, and whether they concur with us or no. For it cometh to pass for want of this, that we are sure to end there where we ought to have begun, which is in questions and differences about words.’ In another place, drawing from the reflection of the inability of men to comprehend accurately, and in the same sense, many of the words they use,—originated, as these words were, by the higher class of intellects for subtle and delicate uses above the discrimination of the vulgar,—the following charitable and consolatory inference: ‘A man that is of judgment and understanding shall sometimes hear ignorant men differ, and know well within himself that those who so differ mean the same thing, and yet they themselves would never agree; and yet if it come so to pass in that distance of judgment which is between man and man, shall not we think that God above, that knows the hearts, doth not discern that frail men in some of their contradictions intend the same thing, and accepted both?’

South, after a masterly definition of what words ought to be, falls into an opposite strain from the dispassionate philosopher, and one more congenial to his caustic humour, showing the mischief which unavoidably follows from the misapplication or confusion of them. ‘The generality of mankind is wholly and absolutely governed by words and names, without, nay, for the most part, even against the knowledge men have of things. The multitude, or common rout, like a drove of sheep or an herd of oxen, may be managed by any noise or cry which their drivers shall accustom them to. . . . As for the meaning of the word itself, that may shift for itself; and as for the sense and reason of it, that has little or nothing to do here; only let it sound full and round, and chime right to the humour which is at present agog (just as a big long rattling name is said to command even adoration from a Spaniard), and no doubt, with this powerful senseless engine the rabble-driver shall be able to carry all before him, or to draw all after him, as he

‘pleases; for a plausible insignificant word in the mouth of an expert demagogue is a dangerous and dreadful weapon.’

To the same purport, but in graver language, Mr. Trench quotes Hooker as saying, ‘The mixture of those things by speech which by nature are divided is the mother of all error.’ Locke has devoted two chapters to the abuse of words, and the evil of using them without distinct ideas, or of applying them sometimes to signify one idea and sometimes another. ‘A definition,’ he says, ‘is the only way whereby the precise meaning of moral words can be known.’ And the study which is here demanded for the right comprehension of questions in morals and philosophy is by masters of style held as essential to a proper enjoyment of works of fancy and imagination. Addison holds that a man cannot enter into a good metaphoric description without previous accurate knowledge of language; ‘For, to have a true relish and form a right judgment of a description, a man should be born with a good imagination, and must have well weighed the force and energy that lie in the several words of a language, so as to be able to distinguish which are most expressive and significant to their proper ideas, and what additional strength and beauty they are capable of receiving from conjunction with others. The fancy must be warm to retain the print of those images it hath received from outward objects, and the judgment discerning to know what expressions are most proper to clothe and adorn them to the best advantage. A man who is deficient in either of these respects, though he may receive the general notion of a description, can never see distinctly all its particular beauties; as a person with a weak sight may have the confused prospect of a palace that lies before him without entering into its several parts, or discerning the variety of its colours in their full glory and perfection.’

It is for want of this careful self-cultivation that the reading of men in general does them so little good—affects them so little one way or another. It is because they see things and receive ideas in the dim misty way here described; because they have no powers of discrimination to exercise, no nice judgment to be satisfied, no taste by which to measure the efforts of others, and are mainly influenced in the absence of these more healthful impulses by a vague curiosity and a desire to be amused; content to be startled, diverted, horrified, by means which they do not analyse, and to the nature of which they are indifferent. Mr. Trench has done good service to literature as well as to morals, by his very interesting little volume bearing on this subject, and addressed ultimately, through his original hearers, to the class in whom want of thought and choice in their reading

is most excusable, as being a subject on which too little has hitherto been taught them, and with whom the pressure of other pursuits tells against hard reading of any kind. The present volume on 'The Study of Words,' consists of six lectures, first read by Mr. Trench to the pupils of the Winchester training-school, and still bearing traces of oral delivery, in some inaccuracies of style, but composed on so simple and popular a plan, as certainly to engage and sustain the attention of those readers not yet exercised in severer studies, for whom he designs them; while the most critical and experienced will find matter worthy of an attentive perusal. A popular work on this subject is a want supplied; and it was because Mr. Trench felt this want, that he has given his lectures a wider publicity, as he explains in his preface:—

'Had I known any book entering with any fulness, and in a popular manner, into the subject matter of these pages, and making it its exclusive theme, I might still have delivered these lectures, but should scarcely have sought for them a wider audience than their first, gladly leaving the matter in their hands, whose studies in languages had been fuller and riper than my own. But abundant and ready to hand as are the materials for such a book, I did not; while yet it seems to me that the subject is one to which it is beyond measure desirable that their attention who are teaching, or shall have hereafter to teach others, should be directed; so that they shall learn to regard language as one of the chiefest organs of their own education and that of others. For I am persuaded that I have used no exaggeration in saying, that in many a young man "his first discovery that words are living powers, has been like the dropping of scales from his eyes, like the acquiring of another sense, or his introduction into a new world;"—while yet all this may be indefinitely deferred, may, indeed, never find place at all, unless there is some one at hand to help him and to hasten the process; and he who so does will ever after be esteemed by him as one of his very foremost benefactors.'—*Preface*, p. iv.

It is certainly a great step gained, when the mind does think over the words it meets with or which it uses; and that truly deserves the term education which sets the thoughts naturally and without effort into this current. Making the mind not merely a recipient of facts, but competent to weigh and judge, apt at subtle distinctions, able to penetrate under the surface into the full meaning of what is presented to it. And Mr. Trench is right, that even to the very young this study might be made interesting—as there is no better test of a child's intellectual progress than its accurate use of the words at its command. 'And,' as he says to the future schoolmasters whom he is addressing,

'as you will not find, for so I venture to promise, that this study of words will be a dull one when you undertake it yourselves, as little need you fear that it will prove dull and unattractive when you seek to make your own gains herein the gains also of those who may be here after committed to your charge. Only try your pupils, and mark the kindling of

the eye, the lighting up of the countenance, the revival of the flagging attention, with which the humblest lecture upon words, and on the words especially which they are daily using, which are familiar to them in their play, or at their church, will be welcomed by them. There is a sense of reality about children, which makes them rejoice to discover that there is also a reality about words, that they are not merely arbitrary signs, but living powers; that, to reverse the words of one of England's "false prophets," they may be the fool's counters, but are the wise man's money; not like the sands of the sea, innumerable disconnected atoms, but growing out of roots, clustering in families, connecting and intertwining themselves with all that men have been doing and thinking and feeling, from the beginning of the world till now.—P. 24.

This *fact*, perfectly understood, even before the mind can go any way towards proving it, is knowledge—and that best kind of knowledge which leads to thought and a respectful sense of other men's labours. The boy learns that there is something to be known even about the simplest and most familiar words, which all men do not know; and that a word could not be changed at random for one possessed of no history or derivation, without so far degrading the language and the speaker who uses it; of which the records of slang afford abundant evidence. A thought which may well lighten the task of acquiring a foreign tongue, assisting him, by some sense of the utility of his labours, through the many toilsome hours the acquisition of a dead language may cost him; which he is too often encouraged to consider waste of time, and the acquisition of barren words as opposed to living knowledge, not only by his own superficial questionings but by other superficial thinkers, who have neither his youth nor his weariness of his task as an excuse for the shallowness of the argument. It is something to realize that he cannot fully understand the meaning of his own tongue and the force of its terms without this labour, and that if all abandoned it, its history would fall into oblivion. Bearing on this subject, Mr. Trench has some good illustrations.

'But seek, I would further urge you, to attain a consciousness of the multitude of words which there are, that, now used only in a figurative sense, did yet originally rest on some fact of the outward world, vividly presenting itself to the imagination; a fact which the world has incorporated for ever, having become, as all words originally were, the indestructible vesture of thought. If I may judge from my own experience, I think there are few intelligent boys in your schools, who would not feel that they had gotten something, when you had shown them that to "insult" means properly to leap as on the prostrate body of a foe; "to affront," to strike him on the face; that "to succour" means to run and place oneself under one that is falling, and thus support and sustain him; to "relent," (connected with "lentos," not "lenis,") to slacken the swiftness of one's pursuit; "to reprehend," to lay hold of one with the intention of forcibly pulling him back from the way of his error; that to be "examined" means to be weighed. They would be pleased to learn that a man is called "supercilious" because haughtiness with contempt of others expresses

itself by the raising of the eyebrows or "supercilium;" that "subtle," (subtilis for subtexilis) is literally "fine-spun;" that "imbecile," which we use for weak, and now always for weak in intellect, means strictly, (unless indeed we must renounce this etymology,) leaning upon a staff, (in bacillo,) as one aged or infirm might do; that "chaste" is perfectly white, "castus" being a participle of "candeo," as it is now generally allowed; that "sincere" may be, I will not say that it is, without wax, (sine cerâ,) as the best and finest honey should be; that a "companion" is one with whom we share our bread, a messmate; that a "sarcasm" is, properly, such a lash inflicted by "the scourge of the tongue" as brings away the *flesh* after it; that "desultory," which, perhaps, they have been warned they should not be in their studies, but have never attached any very definite meaning to the warning, means properly leaping, as a rider in the circus does, from the back of one running horse to that of another, this rider being technically called a "desultor;" and the word being transferred from him to those who suddenly and abruptly change their courses of study.'—P. 196.

To this illustration of the moral use to be drawn from a knowledge of derivations, leading the youthful thinker ages back, to the first makers of the term, and to the vivid sense in which it must have been first applied, we shall add, though it comes in another connexion, the author's further lesson on the importance of an acquaintance with other languages, as furnishing the only storehouses for fresh words and further extensions of ideas: a vast benefit in the early days of our language, but not of much practical importance in the present time, and in the present stage of the English tongue, which, enriched as it has been from all the stores of dead and living languages, is an instrument now adapted to all the refinements and abstractions of thought. Believing it to have attained maturity, it should be our object rather to preserve it unimpaired, than to add to it without the most vigilant and jealous caution, and under urgent and acknowledged necessity.

'But to return to the more deliberate coining of words. This will often find place for the supplying of discovered deficiencies in a language. The manner in which men most often become aware of such deficiencies is, through the comparison of their own language with another, and a richer; a comparison which is forced upon them, so that they cannot put it by, when it becomes necessary for them to express in their own tongue that which has already found utterance in another, and so has at any rate shown that it is utterable in human speech. Without such a comparison, the existence of the want would probably have seldom dawned even on the most thoughtful. For language is to so great an extent the condition and limit of thought—men are so little accustomed, indeed so little able, to meditate on things, except through the intervention, and by the machinery of words, that nothing short of this would bring them to a sense of the actual existence of any such want; and it is, I may observe, one of the advantages of acquaintance with another language besides our own, and of the institution which will follow, if we have learned that other to any purpose, of these comparisons, that we thus come to be aware that names are not, least of all the names which any single language possesses, co-extensive with things, (and by "things," I mean subjects as well as objects of thought, whatever one can *think* about,) that a multitude of things exist,

which, though capable of being resumed in a word, are yet without one, unnamed and unregistered; so that, vast as is the world of names, the world of realities is even vaster still. Such discoveries the Romans made when they attempted to transplant the moral philosophy of Greece to an Italian soil; they found that many of its words had no equivalents in their own tongue, which equivalents therefore they proceeded with more or less success to devise for themselves, appealing with this view to the latent capacities of their own tongue. For example, the Greek schools had a word, and one playing no unimportant part in some of their systems, to express apathy on the absence of all passion and pain. As it was absolutely necessary to possess a corresponding word, Cicero invented "*indolentia*," as the "if I may so speak," with which he paves the way to his first introduction of it, manifestly declares.—P. 111.

In spite of our acknowledged obligations to the past, in spite of the fact, that unless there had been inventors and innovators in old times, who boldly ventured to intrude a new sound on men's ears, without which we of the present day should find ourselves sadly straitened in our vocabulary, we yet think there is no point in which it is so natural to be conservative, and, as we have said, jealous of any change whatever, as in words. We fully acquiesce in the opinion of Ben Jonson, partly excepted against by Mr. Trench, that 'a man coins not a new word without some peril, and less fruit; for if it happen to be received, the praise is but moderate; if refused, the scorn is assured.' It is a sentiment at least which every age will make more true.

Words are a part of ourselves: they are the dress of our minds: and as he is seldom the wisest man who makes the first change in the fashion of his garments, though others may be led afterwards to adopt his invention; so the coiners of new words and those who are eager to take up and patronise the novelty must bear the charge of fancifulness and even affectation, unless they have some stringent necessity to plead for the innovation. There is a paper in 'The Spectator' on this subject upon the introduction of French military terms, complaining that the newspapers, in describing our victories, used so many dark expressions, '*reconnoitre*,' '*carte blanche*,' '*Gasconade*,' &c. that many a prudent citizen, after having read every article had to inquire of his next neighbour what news the mail had brought.

Some prejudice we ourselves must own to the preacher who enjoins on us a *prayerful* spirit. Who does not a little question the school or else the cultivation of the man who commends his friend or his friend's book as *talented*? nor do we think the better of a person, who, in his zeal against that other new invention, '*shams*,' must talk of *actualities*, and *such* *desires* attempts at being more real than reality itself—once a word has gained any sort of footing,

open to graver objections, and of less respectable parentage, than the affectations we have adduced, its chances of spreading are so great, that each day ought to make us more lenient towards the users of it. We remember the time when the ladies of our acquaintance would have felt it as impossible to frame their lips to such words as—we pause ere we write them—*humbug* and *bore*, as to any word of undoubted impropriety; now, if the accent be but soft, and the pronunciation refined, we are forced to take in good part, what is meant in all simplicity. Men have incorporated these and similar words into the language, and being in their nature expressive, they will present themselves as the first representatives of ideas, and force themselves into society too good for them.

The question of synonyms, to which Mr. Trench devotes his fifth lecture, is one of more practical importance where a language has attained or approaches to maturity. We do not wish to increase our possessions where our territories are already so wide, but to ascertain the full value and resources of those we have. In an accurate feeling on this point lies indeed the difference between a loose and a forcible style; in the power of choosing, amongst many words or expressions which approximate to our meaning, the one which alone exactly expresses it; for if the idea or image is a distinct one, it is probable that there is only one perfect *best* way of saying it; though there may be a hundred which will tolerably represent it. ‘Every word,’ it has been said, ‘is appropriate to some one idea or set of ideas, whose unaltered image that medium alone is formed precisely to transmit. The image conveyed through any other media would be dimmed, distorted, multiplied, magnified, or diminished, and the purpose of language not only frustrated but perverted.’ This axiom enforced would make talking and writing a serious matter with most men. But any enforcement of the exact, definite, inalienable meaning of words brings us to the reflection how infinitely various are men’s powers in this respect. We all are acquainted with some talkers, and very lengthy talkers too, whose words are no other than a sort of loose wrapper to their meaning—not from hypocrisy, but because they have (either through natural dimness of perception, or defective and narrow education, or the habit of unreflecting talk,) no real notion of the meaning of words; their conception is dressed up in fragments,—it has no garments of its own. We are left to guess what may be intended underneath, as through the coating of some cast or mould, which shows a distant uncouth resemblance of the image within, but no like-

This, however, is an extreme case, though every one must see one of whom such a description would not be over-

drawn; and all must be familiar with the fatigue and labour of mind which is the portion of the listener under such discourses. Ordinary talkers and writers can approach their meaning a little closer,—or, we should say, they have a more definable meaning,—but still such an one as may be as well expressed by a dozen different terms. They do not seek for accuracy, they have no desire for it: there is no necessity for one word more than another to give body to an image or a notion which is vague till determined by the form which chance rather than choice moulds it into. To such we can attend without effort, but their talk makes no impression—it is the average conversation of mankind. There are others who, having a vivid and distinct meaning and no physical hindrances to a free expression, say the thing they mean; their arrow hits the mark—we feel that no other words would have admitted us into their inner mind as clearly. Now these, whether they know it or not, whether it is the fruit of study or a happy intuition, are yet adepts at the finer arts of discrimination; they can distinguish with the skill of a philologist, though it may be unconsciously, the minute, delicate points of difference in terms that have a general resemblance, which pass in most minds for the same; they can choose words whose associations will bring the subjects home with liveliness and energy to our hearts. All judicious study of words must help towards the attainment of this art, so far at least as to secure against looseness and incorrectness of expression. Eloquence and felicity cannot be taught. Mr. Trench thus introduces this part of his subject after his first definition of the term:—

‘Synonyms, then, as the word is generally understood, and as I shall use it here, are words with slighter differences already existing between them, or with the capabilities of such:—neither on the one side absolutely identical; but neither, we may add, on the other, only very remotely related to one another; for the differences between these last will be self-evident, will so lie on the surface and proclaim themselves to all, that it would be impossible to make them clearer than they already are, and it would be like holding a candle to the sun to attempt it. They must be words which are more or less liable to confusion, but which yet ought not to be confounded: words, as one has said, “*quæ conjungi, non confundi, debent*,” words in which there originally inhered a difference, or between which, though once absolutely identical, such has gradually grown up, and so established itself in the use of the best writers, and in the instinct of the best speakers of the tongue, that it claims to be recognised and openly admitted by all. But here an interesting question presents itself to us, which is this: How do languages come to possess synonyms of this latter class, which are differenced not by etymology or other deep-lying and necessary distinction, but only by usage? Now, if they had been made by agreement, of course no such words could exist; for when one word had been found which was the adequate representative of a feeling or an object, no further one would have been sought. But languages are the

result of processes very different from, and far less regular and formal than this. Various tribes, and each with its own dialect, kindred indeed, but in many respects distinct, coalesce into one people, and cast their contributions of language into the common stock.'—P. 143.

Thus we have supplied from these sources various terms originally of the same signification; but as a language grows and has need of expression for more complex ideas, these terms separate from one another, and are gradually applied to distinguish different degrees and shades of the same idea, and in course of time become confirmed in their new distinct uses. In illustration of this process, Mr. Taylor, in his book on English Synonyms, adduces the words 'to *recal*, to *repeal*, to *revoke*, to *call back*. To *recal* is English, to *repeal* is French (*rappeler*), and to *revoke* is Latin (*revocare*), for the same idea, to call back.' Our conversation is English; we *recal* our directions to servants and other family arrangements. Our laws are French; we *repeal* acts of parliament. Our oratory is Latin; we *revoke* a panegyric, a denunciation, a promise, or a threat. To *repeal* is legally, and to *evoke* solemnly, to *recal*. We *recal* things, we call back persons. Again, in the words to *uncover*, to *discover*, to *detect*: the first is Saxon, the second French, the third Latin, for the same action of removing the cover; but to *uncover* is merely to take off the covering; to *discover*, is to lay bare that which was covered; and to *detect*, is to lay bare that which was intended to be concealed. And Mr. Trench instances the words 'trick,' 'device,' 'finesse,' 'artifice,' and 'stragem,' as an example of the numerous sources from which we get similar words: *trick* being Saxon, *devisa* Italian, *finesse* French, *artificium* Latin, and *stratagema* Greek, all originally expressive of the same idea, but now invested with different shades of meaning.

But where the etymology and the source are the same, custom still assigns differences of meaning. Custom, it has been said, is law in the matter of words; etymology only the commentary, enabling us to ascertain more clearly what the law of custom is, which it is the synonymist's business to trace out. Take the various derivatives of *effect*: *effective*, *efficient*, *efficacious*, *effectual*; as ingeniously adduced by Mr. Taylor. Causes, which have usually a share in producing a given effect, are called *effective*; which have actually a share, are called *efficient*; which have a large share, are called *efficacious*; which have a decisive share, are called *effectual*. These differences arise from custom; in the following examples etymology is the guide: *separation*, *diversity*, *difference*, *discrimination*: separation by the *dis* (from *tango*) makes a distinction; by turning apart (*dis* and *fero*) makes a diversity; by carrying asunder (*dis* and *fero*) makes a difference; by affixing a mark (*dis* and *crimen*) makes a

discrimination. Distinction is therefore applied to delicate variations; diversity, to glaring contrasts; difference, to hostile unlikeness; and discrimination, to formal criticism. Or again, in *attractions* and *allurements*: where attractions draw (*ad* and *trahere*), allurements beckon (*ad* and *leurrer*) towards the possessor; attractions are natural, and allurements are contrived, invitations. The attractions of beauty, the allurements of coquetry.

As examples are the great charm of this subject, we will give Mr. Trench's list of synonyms from different languages:—

'The two causes which I mentioned above,—the fact that English is, in the main, a compromise between the languages spoken by the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman, and the further circumstance that it has received, welcomed, and found place for many later additions, these have together effected that we possess in English a great many duplicates, not to speak of triplicates, or even such a quintuplicate as that which I adduced just now, where the Saxon, French, Italian, Latin, and Greek, had each given us a word. Let us mention a few duplicate substantives—Anglo-Saxon and Latin. Thus we have "shepherd" and "pastor," "feeling" and "sentiment," "hand-book" and "manual," "shire" and "county," "ship" and "navy," "anger" and "ire," "grief" and "dolour," "love" and "charity," "feather" and "plume," "forerunner" and "precursor," "freedom" and "liberty," "murder" and "homicide," "moons" and "lunes,"—a word which has not been met with in the singular. Sometimes, in theology and science especially, we have gone both to the Latin and to the Greek, and drawn the same word from them both; thus, "deist" and "theist," "numeration" and "arithmetical," "Revelation" and "Apocalypse," "temporal" and "chronical," "compassion" and "sympathy," "supposition" and "hypothesis."—P. 149.

From nouns we pass on to verbs and adjectives, which each have many duplicates, as to 'heal,' to 'cure,' to 'soften,' to 'mollify,' 'almighty,' 'omnipotent,' 'shady,' 'umbrageous.' And examples follow of synonymous adjectives where the nouns have no synonyms, drawn from that list of adjectives given by Horne Tooke, where our language has adapted foreign adjectives to English nouns, as 'burdensome' and 'onerous,' 'priestly' and 'sacerdotal,' 'kingly' and 'regal,' 'bloody' and 'sanguine.' Though not to the point here, the fact is a curious one, how many of our Saxon nouns have no adjective derived from them, but are indebted for them to the Latin and French, as 'mouth,' which has 'oral,' 'side,' 'lateral,' 'word,' 'verbal,' 'being,' 'essential,' 'cat,' 'feline,' 'sun,' 'solar,' 'spring,' 'vernal,' 'end,' 'final,' 'money,' 'pecuniary,' 'thing,' 'real,' &c. But now to give Mr. Trench's distinctions, where we beg to dissent from his opinion of the present meaning of our word *charity*. The confounding of *charity* with *alms-giving* is a vulgar error rather than a received use. While the 13th chapter of 1 Corinthians is read in our churches, this mistake cannot prevail; those who use 'charity' in a technical sense know that they do so.

'But to return; if we look closely at those other words which have succeeded in maintaining side by side their ground, we shall not fail to observe

that in almost every instance they have asserted for themselves separate spheres of meaning, that although not in etymology, they have still in use become more or less distinct. Thus we use "shepherd" almost always in its primary meaning, keeper of sheep; while "pastor" is exclusively used in the tropical sense, one that feeds the flock of God; at the same time the language having only the one adjective, "pastoral," that, of necessity, is common to both. "Love," "charity," are used in our authorized version of Scripture promiscuously, and out of the sense of their equivalence are made to represent one and the same Greek word; but in modern use, "charity" has come almost exclusively to signify one particular manifestation of love, the supply of the bodily needs of others; "love" continuing to express the affection of the soul. "Ship" remains in its literal meaning, while "nave" has become a symbolical term used in sacred architecture alone. So with "illegible" and "unreadable," the first is applied to the handwriting, and the second to the subject-matter written; thus, a man writes an illegible hand; he has published an unreadable book. So, too, it well becomes boys to be boyish, but not men to be "puerile," &c. —P. 152.

We must cut short our examples of the process of desynonymizing—a long word, which the wealth of our language has rendered necessary. One instance Mr. Trench gives of successful practice in this art, which is interesting. Until Wordsworth's day, though there was a sense of difference between the words 'imagination' and 'fancy,' yet they were continually confounded. The poet of our age has once and for ever assigned its peculiar place to each. Certain it is that so accurate a writer as Addison does confound them, as where, in his course of interesting papers on the Imagination, he says, 'By the pleasures of the imagination or fancy (which I shall use promiscuously) I here mean such as arise from visible objects,' &c. And again; 'Besides, the pleasures of the *imagination* have this advantage above those of the understanding, that they are more obvious and more easy to be acquired. It is but opening the eyes, and the scene enters; the colours paint themselves to the *fancy*,' &c. While Bacon, we are sorry to say, instead of nicely discriminating between the two, confounds both these faculties divine, with *lying*; only distinguishing between the lie of imagination and the lie of falsehood. 'The mixture of a lye,' he says, 'doth ever add pleasure. . . . One of the Fathers, in great severity, called poesy *vinum demonium*, because it filleth the imagination; and yet it is but with the shadow of a lye. But it is not the lye which passeth through the mind, but the lye that sinketh in, and settleth in it, that doth the hurt.'

Some good things on the moral value of synonyms are said, for which we have not space at length; in the distinctions, for instance, between *apprehend* and *comprehend*, as when we can apprehend truths which are yet above our comprehension; between 'opposite' and 'contrary,' where again it is possible to believe *opposite* truths but not contrary ones; and again between

'compulsion' and 'obligation,' 'discovery' and 'invention,' 'instruction' and 'education,' 'vengeance' and 'revenge.' The following words are ably discriminated, which are very generally used promiscuously:—

'Or consider the following words: "to hate," "to loathe," "to detest," "to abhor." Each of them rests on an image entirely distinct from the others; two, the first and second, being Anglo-Saxon, and the others Latin. "To hate," is properly to be *inflamed* with passionate dislike, the word being connected with "heat" and "hot;" just as we speak, using the same figure, of persons being "incensed" with anger, and of their anger "kindling;" "ira" and "uro" being perhaps related. "To loathe" is properly to feel nausea, the turning of the stomach at that which excites first natural, and then by a transfer, moral disgust. "To detest" is to bear witness against, not to be able to keep silence in regard to something, and to feel ourselves obliged to lift up our voice and testimony against it. "To abhor" is to shrink shuddering back, as one would from an object of fear, an hissing serpent rising in one's path. Our blessed Lord "hated" to see His Father's house profaned, when, the zeal of that house consuming Him, He drove forth in anger the profaners from it; He "loathed" the lukewarmness of the Laodiceans, when He threatened to spue them out of His mouth; He "detested" the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and Scribes, when He proclaimed their sin, and uttered those eight woes against them; He "abhorred" the evil suggestions of Satan, when He bade the tempter to get behind Him, seeking to put a distance between Himself and him."—P. 161.

The following nice distinction throws a new light on the value of the study of words, as an aid to the conscience, often perplexed between obedience to its demands, and what is due to society; by suggesting, as it does, a cautious etymological weighing of synonyms; where an acquaintance with the literal meanings of words may enable us to avoid exaggeration, and pay a compliment and speak truth at the same time. We could almost have wished Mr. Trench had pursued further the science of truthful good-breeding, and given us a conscientious form for 'not at home,' or for civilly and honestly accepting an unwelcome invitation.

'There is often a moral value in the possession of synonyms, enabling us, as they do, to say exactly what we intend, without exaggeration, or the putting of more into our words than we feel in our hearts, allowing us, as one has said, to be at once courteous and precise. Such moral advantage there is, for example, in the choice which we have between the words "to felicitate" and "to congratulate," for the expressing of our sentiments and wishes in regard of the good fortune that happens to others. To "felicitate" another, is to wish him happiness without affirming that his happiness is also ours. Thus out of that general goodwill with which we ought to regard all, we might "felicitate" one almost a stranger to us; nay more, I can honestly "felicitate" one on his appointment to a post, or attainment of honour, even though I may not consider him the fittest to have obtained it,—though I should have been glad if another had done so; I can desire and hope, that is, that it may bring all joy and happiness to him. But I could not, without a violation of truth, "congratulate" him, or that stranger whose prosperity awoke no lively delight in my heart.

for when I "congratulate" a person, (*con gratulor*;) I declare that I am sharer in his joy: that what has rejoiced him, has rejoiced also me. We have all, I daresay, felt, even without having made any such analysis of the distinction between the words, that "congratulate" is a far heartier word than "felicitate," and one with which it much better becomes us to welcome the good fortune of a friend; and the analysis, as you perceive, perfectly justifies the feeling. "Felicitations" are little better than compliments; "congratulations" are the expression of a genuine sympathy and joy.—P. 165.

There is a spurious sort of synonyms which we would gladly see set down by those writers who can so nicely weigh the value and force of real ones; which are indeed better described as periphrastic sayings; those numerous methods, we mean, by which would-be wits and fine writers succeed in never 'calling a spade a spade.' It must have been synonyms of this order of which the Arabian writer spoke, when he gloried in his language containing fourscore words for honey, and a thousand for a sword, two hundred names for serpent, and five hundred for a lion. Some of these words, we will be bound to say, went considerably out of the way to convey the idea either of a sword or a lion, and he must have been no inconsiderable scholar who should know at once what object all the names meant; just such erudition is, by masters of this style, required of us. We should be glad to know how many names some historians have framed for the word 'king,' names infinitely perplexing to short memories and plain understandings, which have to keep up an exact knowledge of all the titles, moral qualities, and social relations of the king under discussion, without which the battle may be won, or the alliance contracted, and we not be made the wiser, because we can never get clearly to know who fought the one or engaged in the other. It is still worse with works of humour and fiction, where, often, the author cannot get along, far less his reader follow him, for the endless delays into which his fancy betrays him. The allusions are so continual as every moment to break the thread of the narrative, till in admiring his curious expedients for never calling a husband a husband, or a horse a horse, we lose all interest in what the husband or the horse is doing. We do not dispute that there are occasions when a thing is more vividly described by its accidents than its inherent qualities. It may once have given point to a description to say that such an one mounted his *Rosinante*, if it is of consequence that we should know the horse to have been a lean one, but the oftener we are called off from the rider to think of his horse—we wish the author to be assured—the less we shall care about the rider. Nothing is so irksome as continual interruption to the train of thought. Yet it is very true all the notion some writers have of wit is comprised in this perpetual misnaming. It has been well said

of these men, that they are like mountebanks, — they make a man a wit by putting on him a fantastic habit. This indeed is no new way of being clever, the old essayists complained of it in their day, and quote a distich from a poem, every line of which is a riddle, very much to our point, which we give as a less invidious example of our meaning than a modern instance might appear. The poem is describing a bonfire, in which—

‘ The Cynic’s rolling tenement conspires
With Bacchus his cast-coat to feed the fires.’

Certainly, says the commentator, the reader must consider twice or thrice before he will know the Cynic’s tenement is a tub, and Bacchus his cast-coat, an empty hogshead. One merit, indeed, these enigmas possess over their modern successors,—they even now have an air of originality, whereas, the style we censure is the very essence of all that is trite and stale. Nothing ever seems said for the first time, and the mind, perplexed already, is still further tasked to recal where it has heard all this false humour before.

From the uses and abuses of a luxuriant vocabulary,—the gradual acquisition of a developing, progressing, discovering, reading, talking, thinking, reasoning, disputing, travelling community,—the transition is strange to those distant nations, or to those neglected portions of our own, with whom speech itself is being cut short—whose language is like an autumn tree, dropping its leaves, one by one, from failure of that sap of thought which should sustain them—who lose words by ceasing to use them, or to occupy themselves with the ideas of which they are the signs.

In his argument for the divine origin of language,—a direct gift from God to man at his creation,—as opposed to the infidel theory that the primitive condition of man was the savage one, Mr. Trench explains his view to be, not that man had his language ready formed to his hand in its fulness, but the structure of it; not the names of everything that met his eye or his reason, but the power of *naming* and of expressing the relation of things to each other. The language of the savage, so far from possessing this healthful power of growing and developing, shows—as all who analyse it bear witness—marks of decay; is evidently a ruin of something nobler and better than it is now, with traces still of cultivation, intelligence, and religion, which are rapidly becoming fewer and fainter. One by one, words expressive of abstract ideas or the usages of civilized life drop away, and with them departs the power of reviving the lost thought or humanizing custom, so that both the language and the habits of savage life must retrograde, till aided from without.

The following are interesting illustrations of the truth of this melancholy fact:—

‘ Moffat, in his *Missionary Labours and Scenes in South Africa*, gives us a very remarkable example of the disappearing of one of the most significant words from the language of a tribe sinking ever deeper in savagery; and with the disappearing of the word, of course, the disappearing as well of the great spiritual fact and truth whereof that word was at once the vehicle and guardian. The Bechuanas, a Caffre tribe, employed formerly the word “Morimo,” to designate “Him that is above,” or, “Him that is in heaven,” and attached to the word the notion of a supreme Divine Being. This word, with the spiritual idea corresponding to it, Moffat found to have vanished from the language of the present generation, although here and there he could meet with an old man, scarcely one or two in a thousand, who remembered in his youth to have heard speak of “Morimo;” and this word, once so deeply significant, only survived now in the spells and charms of the so-called rain-makers and sorcerers, who misused it to designate a fabulous ghost, of whom they told the absurdest and most contradictory things. And as there is no such witness to the degradation of the savage as the brutal poverty of his language, so is there nothing that so effectually tends to keep him in the depths to which he has fallen. You cannot impart to any man more than the words which he understands either now contain, or can be made intelligibly to him, to contain. Language is as truly on one side the limit and restraint of thought, as on the other side that which feeds and unfolds it. Thus it is the ever-repeated complaint of the Missionary, that the very terms are wholly, or nearly wholly, wanting in the dialect of the savage, whereby to impart to him heavenly truths, or indeed, even the nobler emotions of the human heart. Dobrizhoffer, the Jesuit Missionary, in his curious *History of the Abipones*, tells us that neither they nor the Guarinies, two of the principal native tribes of Brazil, possessed any word in the least corresponding to our “thanks.” But what wonder, if the feeling of gratitude was entirely absent from their hearts, that they should not have possessed the corresponding word in their vocabularies? Nay, how should they have had it there? And that this is the true explanation is plain, from a fact which the same writer records, that although inveterate askers, they never showed the slightest sense of obligation or of gratitude, when they obtained what they sought; never saying more than, “This will be useful to me,” or, “This is what I wanted.”—P. 18.

Another cause for the decay of this language is given by Dobrizhoffer, not bearing on our author’s argument, but curious in itself, and illustrative of the way in which uncivilized dialects may change and lose themselves; perplexing and confounding all inquiry into their source. These Abipones, and other kindred tribes speaking originally the same language, had the custom of abolishing the name of every one who died. Thus, as every one took his name from some visible object, a new name for this object must necessarily be substituted for the old one. These new titles being, it may be supposed, arbitrary, and not spreading beyond the use or knowledge of the tribe itself, it is easy to understand how soon languages originally alike, must lose all other resemblance but that of construction. Whether these savages had exhausted all the good names in their his-

torian's time, we know not, but they had certainly begun with the bad ones; one of their leading heroes being entitled Chief, or Lord Liar. *Nomine suo dignissimus*, as Dobrizhoffer says.

Even in our own country, in the lower classes, those who, from neglect, intemperance, and different forms of vice, are sunk lowest in the scale, this same decay of language may be observed. We believe that a searching inquiry into the actual vocabulary of many of our fellow-citizens would astonish even those prepared to be surprised by its miserable scantiness and poverty, and its lack of all power to express abstract or spiritual ideas. The desolation never can be ascertained in its real extent. Children drawn from the courts and alleys of crowded, neglected neighbourhoods to be taught and instructed, betray something of the evil. Their total ignorance of all words of dignity or elevation is a serious obstacle to their receiving ideas of that character. No one can tell how little the simplest truth can work its way into a mind weighed down by a low and degraded phraseology. For as it is the tendency of language, as it enlarges and refines itself, to give secondary meanings to words, to raise them from the literal to the figurative, and to apply to the actions and operations of the mind terms originally applied to bodily actions and visible objects, till the figurative meaning supersedes the literal in our minds, and of words whose flight leads us up to heaven, we do not remember that their nest was on the ground,—so in the degradation of language, an opposite order prevails. It resorts again to literal meanings and takes visible objects for its sole mode of expressing even spiritual things. Instead of embracing the idea, the vulgar are engrossed with the physical objects connected with it, they cannot get beyond what they see, and hear, and touch: having yielded to the tyranny of the senses, they are now their prey, and are confined within their range. Examples must be inadequate, and what is worse, they must be vulgar.—But as a faint illustration of our meaning: The teacher of a Sunday school has occasion to administer a reproof. He is grave and affectionate, he seeks to bring mind to bear on mind, to wake the conscience, to appeal to the feelings, to lift the intellect into a higher region of thought. The rebuke is not ill taken, not sullenly or in bad temper, but the culprit on reporting the occurrence, through no intentional disrespect, simply because he knows no other form of expression, says he has had a 'jawing,' and the reprover hears it whispered round that 'he's been "jawing" Dick Thompson;' this being the received word for clamorous upbraidings in scenes where, perhaps, wholesome reproof is little heard; and descriptive of the distortions of passion on the countenance, not of any mental operation: for in all cases where

body and spirit mingle, the tendency of the vulgar is to confine themselves to the consideration of the *body*. Thus death is always alluded to by them as it concerns the body, with eager appreciation of every circumstance bearing on this body's decay and dissolution. A lady in a mourning dress knocks at the door of a woman of this class where she has often visited. Mourning, of course, is associated with the idea of death. With the thoughtful of every degree, this is a complex idea. They think of loss, of the grief of the survivor, of a spirit departing to a new world, till the vast range of sympathies opened out for the dead and the living throw into the background the thought of dissolution and the grave. Not so with the observer here. In her the sight of a black gown raises no images but those of mortality—a coffin, a mound of loose earth, the sexton with his mattock standing by an open grave. No feelings are awakened of tenderness, compassion, or mystery; only curiosity to know who can be the subject of these terrors, suggesting at once the startling question put to her visitor without preface or delay, '*Have you buried one of your children?*' Even in the religion of the vulgar, where some ideas have been received of a future life, some knowledge of Christian truths, still the body *represents* the soul, and as their minds cannot or will not follow the soul's workings apart from it, they confound the aspirations of the heart with their outward manifestation. Ejaculations, which should be regarded simply as natural expressions of strong inward feeling, become the very thing to be desired for itself, and a person's salvation is considered secured, if, in the article of death, he has 'hallooed,' or, as it is familiarized, 'hollared a deal.' There is no awe in the vulgar mind,—we use this term 'vulgarity' to describe a state of mind, not a condition of life, though of course, those scenes where it can find freest development are our present concern, and furnish our instances—no care to distinguish between the noble and the base, the sublime and the familiar; everything is reduced to the lowest standard; as where a hired nurse could find no more appropriate or elevating figure to express the tranquil departure of an old woman under her charge, though speaking gravely, and with an intention to convey a correct idea, than that 'she died as easy as an old shoe.' Yet, dull as the mind must be and dead to impressions, to resort to such a comparison, she could not have said this but from utter want of appropriate words and an ignorance that there were such. But we have dwelt long enough on a point which cannot be proved without some breach of rule and propriety. Such of our readers as have any experience of the dialect of the lowest classes, could readily add to our list of examples from a vocabulary which has never yet found its way into dictionaries or any respectable publication; a vocabulary rich enough in its

own line, but from which every term expressive of dignity or elevation is excluded.

It is time to draw our remarks to an end, though many interesting and suggestive portions of these lectures yet remain untouched. Their popular character is sustained throughout. The thoughtful reader, whatever his previous ignorance, is never carried beyond his depth, while the illustrations are so well chosen that he will, perhaps, be surprised to find himself warmly interesting in a subject which he had previously set down as dull and repulsive. It is, however, to be regretted that the style and composition,—we presume from carelessness,—are too often suited neither to the subject of the book nor its readers. The subject of words cannot be far separated from their right placing; Mr. Trench calls them jewels; we wish he had, in many cases, been more careful about their setting. It is a point in which clearness of style is more than commonly essential, for the reader is, as a first step, put into a critical frame of temper, and being called upon to criticise words, the next step is to criticise wording. Being led to think of our old masters of language, we cannot but sometimes institute comparisons between their classical accuracy, their clear order, the 'sweet tune' of their sentences even in prose, their majestic march, with the shambling gait, the mere getting along of some moderns. Our progress through some of the sentences in this little work reminds us more of a walk through a ploughed field than of a march of any kind or to any tune: its ups and downs being in very fair analogy with the alternations of assertion, and qualifying parentheses, which seems to form the system of their composition. The excuse no doubt is, that the lectures were at first orally delivered, and that a good reader can make anything he pleases of his own style; but we still cannot comprehend how Mr. Trench, who has shown in his verse a power of charming the ear as well as the understanding, could suffer such sentences as the following to pass from his pen to the press. As where he quotes 'The Spectator's' complaint of the introduction of new slang words, and then says:—

'In regard of "mob," abbreviated as we see from "mobile," the multitude swayed hither and thither by each gust of passion or caprice, this, which that writer plainly hardly expected, while he confessed it possible, has actually taken place.'—P. 125.

Again, in accounting for the gradual decay of language amongst savages, we have the following sentence, which we suspect would defy the parsing powers of the most practised of his auditors:—

'When wholly letting go the truth, when long and greatly sinning against light and conscience, a people has thus gone the downward way,

has been scattered off by some violent revolution from that portion of the world which is the seat of advance and progress, and driven to its remote isles and further corners, then, as one nobler thought, one spiritual idea after another has perished from it, the words also that expressed these have perished too.—P. 17.

It may seem fastidious or querulous to be thus critical in the order of sentences, with whose matter we so fully agree; but accuracy of style is so essential to the life of books, and even to their present utility, that we cannot see a good book suffer from an awkward and careless style without a protest. We will conclude with the following happy example of the rich fulness of means which lies in single words, which it is one of Mr. Trench's points to prove:—

'Let me illustrate that which I have been here saying somewhat more at length by the word "tribulation." We all know in a general way that this word, which occurs not seldom in Scripture and in the Liturgy, means affliction, sorrow, anguish; but it is quite worth our while to know *how* it means this, and to question the word a little closer. It is derived from the Latin "tribulum," which was the threshing instrument or roller, whereby the Roman husbandmen separated the corn from the husks; and "tribulatio" in its primary significance was the act of this separation. "But some Latin writer of the Christian Church appropriated the word and image for the setting forth of a higher truth; and sorrow, distress and adversity being the appointed means for the separating in men of whatever in them was light, trivial, and poor, from the solid and the true, their chaff from their wheat, therefore he called these sorrows and griefs 'tribulations,' threshings, that is, of the inner spiritual man, without which there could be no fitting him for the heavenly garner."

'Now in proof of my assertion that a single word is often a concentrated poem, a little grain of gold, capable of being beaten out into a broad extent of gold-leaf, I will quote in reference to this very word "tribulation," a graceful composition by George Wither, an early English poet, which you will at once perceive is all wrapped up in this word, being from first to last only the expanding of the image and thought which this word has implicitly given:—

"Till from the straw, the flail the corn doth beat,
Until the chaff be purgèd from the wheat;
Yea, till the mill the grains in pieces tear,
The richness of the flour will scarce appear.
So, till men's persons great afflictions touch,
If worth be found, their worth is not so much,
Because, like wheat in straw, they have not yet
That value which in threshing they may get.
For till the bruising flail of God's corrections /
Have threshèd out of us our vain affections;
Till those affections which do misbecome us,
Are by the Sacred Spirit winnow'd from us;
Until from us the straw of wordly treasures,
Till all the dusty chaff of empty pleasures;
Yea, till His flail upon us He doth lay,
To thresh the husk of this our flesh away;
And leave the soul uncover'd; nay, yet more,
Till God shall make our very spirit poor,
We shall not up to highest wealth aspire,
And then we shall; and that is my desire."—P. 7.

It will be well if the study of words and the investigation into their force and meaning, wherever pursued, may not stop with the intellect, but become, as they well may, a question with the heart, teaching it to weigh and consider with the more anxious care, as it is enlightened by knowledge, and taught to realize its responsibilities, how it shall acquit itself of a great duty:—ever bearing in mind the awful sentence which identifies the breath of our lips with our inmost thoughts and conscience,—‘By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.’

ART. VII. *Japan: an Account, Geographical and Historical, &c.*
By CHARLES MAC FARLANE. London: Routledge. 1852.

IN defiance of Mr. Mac Farlane's assertion to the contrary, we maintain that even educated persons know little or nothing about Japan. And yet it is called an Empire, and Mr. M'Culloch assures us that it contains 50,000,000 inhabitants: its population we believe actually reaches to half this amount. As far as general impressions go, the ordinary floating feeling—we cannot call it knowledge—about Japan, is, that it seems to realize a good deal the notions conveyed by Swift's Flying Island. We get to think of it as of some Atlantis of the East: a mystery and marvel seldom or very partially revealed to the sons of men. We hear of it as a place surrounded by prejudice as by a wall of brass: a polity complete and total in itself: a great exception to the family of mankind: like the fabled river of antiquity, it is a people which flows through the ocean of society but never mingles with the common stream of humanity. And then the whole world takes offence at this. While we are writing, the government of the United States is meditating an expedition to compel Japan to be neighbourly and civil, and to observe the conventional Law of Nations: that is to say, Western civilization is resolved to open out Japan—not for the sake of Japan, but for the necessities of Western civilization.

It is argued that no nation has a right to occupy an exceptional position: that commerce is, like the air, a chartered libertine; that no people has a right to say, I will not trade with others, except upon my own terms. If the Japanese systematically refused food and water, and the means of repairs to ships, we should say that the American claim was not unreasonable. No nation has a right to block up the highway and to prevent legitimate traffic with others. If it does not choose to trade itself, it must not present an hindrance to trading with others. It is very well to say that Japan must be treated as though it did not exist, and that our proper course is to take it upon its own grounds, and simply avoid it. But common sense revolts at this theorizing: the Japanese Empire lies right across some fifteen degrees of latitude: it is a physical obstruction if it does not conform to the natural laws of mankind. Navigation involves certain abstract rights, which are not so much a matter of common consent as of antecedent natural justice. A ship in distress has claims for water, wood, and fresh provisions, and for means of refitting and repairing accidents. These claims are not a matter of political agreement, but are physical results from the mere constitution of the planet. And in this sense, and for fundamental elementary

necessities, the earth and sea are common property. But as a fact, Japan does not refuse these elementary rights. To take only our own vessels: in 1791 the 'Argonaut' received wood and water. The 'Providence' landed its crew for nautical observations on the coast of Yesso, and refitted. The 'Phaeton,' Captain 'Pellew,' in the early part of the present century took in water. The 'Samarang' was in 1845 supplied with stores by the Japanese authorities; and magnetic observations were, though very reluctantly, permitted. In 1849, Captain Mackinnon of H.M.S. 'Mariner,' received vegetables and water from the islanders.

What the Japanese decline is, to trade with any other country except on their own terms. Acutely enough, they guard against the slightest violation of their principle of exclusion. In all the cases which we have mentioned payment for supplies sent on board was refused. The transaction was one of natural charity, not of commerce. Under these circumstances the question is simply whether we can, or ought to, force such a people to trade with us whether they like it or not. The vague series of conventionalisms known as the Law of Nations, has certainly never been accepted by Japan. Vattel is not a text book at Jeddo, nor even in Bundum, which Peter Heylyn affirmed to be 'an university bigger than Paris.' We hardly think that it is fair to quote Puffendorf and Grotius to a community of this sort. And it is difficult to pick a quarrel with Japan. If the Japanese refused assistance to a shipwrecked vessel, this might be the pretext for forcing their ports. As it stands, all that the American President can say is, 'Japan is within 'twenty days' sail of California: Japan has coal, and it would be 'very useful to our steamers: Japan has admirable productions, 'both natural and manufactured; the States have the same: 'reciprocity and trade are very good things: friendly commercial 'intercourse is a great blessing,' &c. But as the Japanese cannot or will not see this, the serious question remains, whether there is any inherent right in one nation, or in all the nations of the earth collectively, to force an outstanding member of mankind into the commercial brotherhood. Speech is a great blessing, and necessary to the existence of society, but if any individual is so sulky or so unmanageable as to decline conversation, we doubt the natural right in his neighbour to make him talk.

Nor are our doubts lessened when we survey the anomalous and extraordinary history of Japan. It was unknown to recent research, till the noble Venetian, Marco Polo, at the end of the thirteenth century, noticed it. The first European who seems to have visited it was Fernam Mendez Pinto, the Portuguese adventurer, whose name, very unjustly, has been considered equivalent to mendacity itself. This visit was in 1542: the

Portuguese were most hospitably received, and allowed free traffic. Seven years after a fugitive Japanese fled to Goa, and was converted to Christianity. The Portuguese, combining worldly wisdom with a deep sense of spiritual duties, at once saw the opening both for trade and the Gospel which Japan afforded: and as early as 1551 the splendid and successful mission of Xavier to Japan had been terminated by the Jesuit apostle's death. Fifty churches and tens of thousands of converts composed the Japanese Church of twenty years later. During the whole of this time—

'The Portuguese,—mariners, merchants, padres, and all,—were received with open arms, not only at Bungo, but at whatsoever other part of the empire they chose to repair unto. The local governments and the minor princes, who then enjoyed a considerable degree of independence, vied with each other in inviting them to their ports and towns. They went wherever they pleased, from one extremity of the empire to the other, and by land as well as by sea. The merchants found a ready and a most profitable market for their goods; the missionaries, an intellectual, tolerant people, very willing to listen to the lessons which they had to teach them. There was no *one* established, dominant religion in the country; the most ancient faith was split into sects; and there were at least three other religions imported from foreign countries, and tolerated in the most perfect manner. Moreover, a faith, said to be of Brahminical origin, and which had been imported from India, was, at the time, widely spread among the people. This faith bore so near a resemblance to the doctrines introduced by the Portuguese, that it must have greatly favoured their reception. It appears to have comprised the *existence, death, and resurrection of a Saviour born of a virgin*, with almost every other essential dogma of Christianity, including the belief in the Trinity. If this be a true statement and correct description, and if we then add to it the tradition, that this form of religion was introduced under the reign of the Chinese emperor Mimi, who ascended the throne in about the fiftieth year of the Christian era, can we avoid admitting the conclusion, that some early apostle reached the eastern extremity of Asia, if not the islands themselves of Japan? Then the pomp and impressive ceremonies of the Roman church, and the frequency of its services, delighted the impressionable Japanese, who, in all probability, would have paid far less attention to a simpler form of worship. The first missionaries, moreover, were men of exemplary lives—modest, virtuous, disinterested, and most tender and charitable to the poor and afflicted. They sought out cases of distress; they attended the sick; and some knowledge they possessed of the superior science of medicine, as practised by the most advanced nations of Europe, was frequently of great benefit to the natives, and another means of facilitating their conversion. Xavier quitted Japan for China in 1551, and died on the second of December of the following year, at Shan-Shan, on the Canton river, not far from Macao; but he left able and enthusiastic missionaries behind him, and others soon repaired to the country.'—*Mac Farlane's Japan*, pp. 4—7.

Without discussing Mr. Mac Farlane's assumption of an apostolic journey to Japan, it is unquestionable that Nestorian missionaries had penetrated into China at a very early period. The celebrated inscription proves this. Whether Buddhism, which is not the original religion of Japan, is, according to

a singular conjecture, a diabolic anticipation of Christianity, or whether much of its present rites and doctrines are not rather corruptions of the Gospel, it is enough to feel convinced that Buddhism does present in itself a singular caricature and distortion of the Gospel. It does not quite appear whether the Japanese Christians were converts from Buddhism, or from the older and national religion of the Sintoos, which seems to differ little from the common Indian systems. The question would be important whether such a resemblance as Buddhism offers of Christianity would be an aid or an obstacle to conversion? The fact however remains, that in less than half a century from its rediscovery, Japan was at free commercial intercourse with the whole western world, and was the seat of a flourishing and promising Church. Before, therefore, we are so especially angry with the Japanese for their seclusion from the world, the inquiry is of immense interest, how the present state of things came about, and who is responsible for it.

It is plain that two hundred and fifty years ago the Japanese ports were open to all ordinary commercial intercourse. The Portuguese had a monopoly of it, chiefly because they had no competitors. Such, however, presented themselves with the seventeenth century. One William Adams, an Englishman, sailed as pilot to a 'fleet of Hollanders,' equipped for the Indian trade in 1598. During this voyage a storm brought him to the Japanese coast. But strange vessels had at that period become suspicious. It is undeniable that Dutch and English ships, if not avowedly buccaneers, acted very piratically. The obligation of treaties ceased at the line. On the Spanish main it was simply Rob Roy's law. We can quite therefore account for and admit 'the evil report made by the Portuguese of the English and 'Dutch.' The Portuguese could not esteem them as other than pirates. The consequence was that William Adams was detained in Japan until the day of his death. But he did his work: he opened the trade to his Dutch friends, who, in 1609, 'came to 'the court of the Emperor, where they were in great friendship 'received, conditioning with the Emperor to send yearly a ship 'or two; the first of which, arriving in 1611, was well received, 'and with great kindness entertained.'

When we say that the Japanese ports and commerce were open to all traders, it must not be understood that, two hundred and fifty years ago, either in Japan or anywhere else was trade carried on with that freedom from local restraints which now generally prevails. What we mean is, that, under regulations, any European community might have got a commercial footing in Japan. Trade was then generally conducted by corporations and factories rather than by individual enterprise. Even in our

own East India trade, up to a comparatively recent period, the quantity of exports and imports was fixed. It was at that time considered necessary to keep up prices by restricting trade. To throw tea and spices overboard is a practice not yet forgotten. It is quite conceivable, therefore, how early in the seventeenth century commercial intercourse with Japan might be free; and yet with a restriction on the number of vessels and amount of commodities permitted to enter its ports.

Before the year 1620, then, the Portuguese and Dutch factories were established side by side on a small island, called Firando, looking over the Korean straits. They were not likely to prove themselves pleasant neighbours or agreeable guests. Of course in those days the Dutch in Portuguese eyes appeared only as heretics, if not atheists; while the Dutch returned the compliment by stigmatizing their brother Christians as mere idolaters. The mutual hatred and suspicions existing between Holland and Portugal were not likely to impress the calm and inquiring Japanese with exalted notions either of Christians in general or Europeans in particular. Nor were the native Christians such as had kindled under Xavier's words of fire, or had melted before his glow of love. Persecution had commenced on the part of the heathen; the Christian orders were divided against each other; Dominican and Franciscan were mutually misrepresented, and stumbling-blocks innumerable were thrown in the Japanese path to the Gospel, and this we fear by Christian hands. The sad history of the proscription of the Gospel in Japan may be told in few words. The Christians may have become rapacious; but it is certain that old powerful heathenism at last found out that toleration of Christianity was in the end treason to Buddhism and Sintoism. No religions could co-exist with the Cross. Christianity must be accepted or destroyed. The Japanese nationalists preferred the latter part of the alternative. The arrival of more missionaries was first forbidden; then conversions were prohibited; at last, a persecution terrible as that of Decius commenced. In 1614 the native converts who would not recant were crucified and tortured; the churches were destroyed; the schools closed, and the profession of Christianity in a Japanese declared illegal. Hitherto the foreign Christians had not been persecuted; but Portuguese missionaries were constantly evading the law. The commercial result was the restriction of foreign trade to the little island of Desima.

But worse remained. A real, or suspected, plot against the Japanese government, said to have been entered into by the Japanese Christians, implicated the Portuguese. It is curious, to say the least, that the documentary evidence of this plot was found in 'a Portuguese ship captured by the *Dutch*.' Whether

the Dutch invented the plot, or only took advantage of it, we cannot pronounce. It is indisputable that they denounced it to the Japanese government; and the result was, that the Portuguese were banished for ever from Japan and its dependencies. Nor was this all. From 1637 commenced the exclusive policy of the Japanese of which Europeans complain. The proclamation which decreed that 'the whole race of the Portuguese, with their mothers, nurses, and whatever belongs to them, shall be banished for ever,' goes on to set forth—

'That no Japanese ship or boat, or any native of Japan, should henceforth presume to quit the country under pain of forfeiture and death; that any Japanese returning from a foreign country should be put to death; that no nobleman or soldier should be suffered to purchase anything of a foreigner; that any person presuming to bring a letter from abroad, or to return to Japan after he had been banished, should die, with all his family, and that whosoever presumed to intercede for such offenders should be put to death, &c.; that all persons who propagated the doctrines of the Christians, or bore that scandalous name, should be seized and immured in the common gaol, &c. A reward was offered for the discovery of every padre or priest, and a smaller reward for the discovery of every native Christian.'—*Ibid.* p. 48.

Here it is obvious to remark, that whichever version of this incident is true, whether the Portuguese did enter into a political plot against the Japanese government, or whether the Dutch, out of mere jealousy to Portugal, invented the conspiracy, and the Portuguese complicity with it, the result is the same. The Japanese expelled Europeans, and restricted their intercourse with the whole world, on account of European intrigue. They acted in self-defence. Their policy might be short-sighted and bigoted: but the Europeans compelled it. We are only witnessing and suffering under the untoward results of the duplicity and intrigues, or the treachery and bigotry, of the seventeenth century.

This was the hour of temptation to the Dutch, and they were not proof against it. Bitter rivals both in commerce and religion to the Portuguese, they did all they could to exasperate the contest between the Portuguese and Japanese. If they did not cause the Portuguese expulsion, they mainly contributed to it; and this under the most discreditable and degrading circumstances. Though nominally a dispute between Japan and Portugal, it was, in fact, a controversy between Heathenism and Christianity. The Dutch took their side and kept it. They ranged themselves with persecution and apostasy. We avail ourselves of Mr. Mac Farlane's judgment in the case, and he is not a prejudiced witness:—

'Though deprived of their padres, or European teachers, and though menaced, not only with imprisonment, but also with torture and death, the converts persevered in their faith. Oppression drove them into open rebellion; and they took refuge, and made an heroic stand against the

troops of the emperor in the province of Sinabara. The imperial government called upon the Dutch to assist them in their war against these Christians; and the Dutch promptly gave the aid required of them. The fact is admitted by all their own countrymen who have written about Japan, from their first writers in the middle of the seventeenth century, down to the year 1833. M. Fischer, the very last on the list, says that the Dutch were *compelled* to join in the persecution against the stubborn remnant of that Christian host. Others would soften the matter by saying that the Dutch *only* supplied the heathen Japanese with gunpowder and guns, taught them a little artillery practice, and sent ammunition, arms, and troops in their ships to the scene of action. But Kämpfer, who was only a German in the Dutch service, most distinctly and positively assures us that the Christian traders acted as auxiliaries and belligerents. The stronghold of the native Christians was an old fortified place, which the emperor's troops could not take.

"The Dutch, upon this, as friends and allies of the emperor, were requested to assist the Japanese in the siege . . . M. Kockebecker, who was then director of the Dutch trade and nation, having received the emperor's orders to this purpose, repaired thither without delay, on board a Dutch ship, lying at anchor in the harbour of Firando (all the other ships, perhaps upon some intimation given, that some such request was like to be made to them from court, set sail but the day before), and within a fortnight's time he battered the old town with 426 cannon-balls, both from on board his ship and from a battery which was raised on shore, and planted with some of his own guns. This compliance of the Dutch, and their conduct during the siege, was entirely to the satisfaction of the Japanese, and although the besieged seemed in no manner of forwardness to surrender, yet, as by this cannonading they had been very much reduced in number, and their strength greatly broken, M. Kockebecker had leave at last to depart, after they had obliged him to land six more of his guns for the use of the emperor."

"A recent writer, a right-hearted and right-minded American, says,—"The walls of Sinabara were unquestionably battered by the Dutch cannon, and its brave defenders were slaughtered. Some apology might be made for this cooperation at the siege of Sinabara, had its defenders been the countrymen of Alva, or Requesens, or John of Austria, or Alexander Farnese. But truth requires that the measures of Kockebecker should be regarded as the alternative, which he deliberately preferred to the interruption of the Dutch trade."

"It appears that the siege was converted into a long and close blockade, and that when the indomitable converts of Xavier were reduced, and in good part exterminated by famine, a storm and an atrocious massacre ensued, none being spared, because none would recant and beg quarter; but men, women, and children being all butchered in heaps. In this war of religion, according to the most moderate estimate, there fell on both sides 40,000 men. According to the papists, the number of native Christians alone was far greater than this, and all the atrocities and horrors of the Diocletian persecution were repeated, exaggerated, and prolonged. The magnitude of the holocaust does indeed afford some measure of the depth and tenacity with which Christianity, in its Roman form, had struck its roots into the soil.

"Over the vast common grave of the martyrs was set up this impious inscription:—"So long as the sun shall warm the earth, let no Christian be so bold as to come to Japan; and let all know, that the King of Spain himself, or the Christians' God, or the great God of all, if he violate this command, shall pay for it with his head."—*Ibid.* pp. 49—52.

The Dutch, however, were disappointed in their hopes: they

derived less benefit from their intrigues and apostasy than they expected. One of themselves, Kämpfer, admits this:—

“By this submissive readiness to assist the emperor in the execution of his designs, with regard to the final destruction of Christianity in his dominions, it is true, indeed, that we stood our ground so far as to maintain ourselves in the country, and to be permitted to carry on our trade, although the court had then some thoughts of a total exclusion of all foreigners whatsoever. But many generous and noble persons, at court and in the country, judged unfavourably of our conduct. It seemed to them inconsistent with reason that the Dutch should ever be expected to be faithful to a foreign monarch, and one, too, whom they look upon as a heathen, whilst they showed so much forwardness to assist him in the destruction of a people with whom they agreed in the most essential parts of their faith (as the Japanese had been well informed by the Portuguese monks), and to sacrifice to their own worldly interests those who followed Christ in the very same way, and hoped to enter the kingdom of heaven through the same gate. These are expressions which I have often heard from the natives, when the conversation happened to turn upon this mournful subject. In short, by our humble complaisance and connivance, we were so far from bringing this proud and jealous nation to any greater confidence, or more intimate friendship, that, on the contrary, their jealousy and mistrust seemed to increase from that time. They both hated and despised us for what we had done. In the year 1641, soon after the total expulsion of the Portuguese, and the suppression of Christianity among the natives, we were ordered to quit our comfortable factory at Firando, and to confine ourselves, under a very rigid inspection, to the small islet of Desima, which is more like a prison than a factory. So great was the covetousness of the Dutch, and so strong the alluring power of the Japanese gold, that rather than quit the prospect of a trade, (indeed most advantageous,) they willingly underwent an almost perpetual imprisonment, for such in fact is our residence at Desima, and chose to suffer many hardships in a foreign and heathen country, to be remiss in performing divine Service on Sundays and solemn festivals, to leave off praying and singing of psalms, entirely to avoid the sign of the cross, the calling upon the name of Christ in presence of the natives, and all the outer signs of Christianity; and lastly, patiently and submissively to bear the abusive and injurious behaviour of these proud infidels towards us, than which nothing can be offered more shocking to a generous and noble mind.”—*Ibid.* pp. 52—54.

To this miserable islet, Desima, the Dutch are confined; the island is only 600 feet long, and is joined to the Japanese city, Nagasaki, by a bridge strongly guarded. The most rigid watch is held on the Dutch; no females are allowed in their community. Their vessels are searched, the guns and ammunition removed, and the crews are only allowed ‘to refresh themselves’ in this filthy prison, Desima; a fit punishment for their treason to the faith and their brethren. They have the gold for which they bartered the gospel duties, but it is poured molten down their throats. With respect to their practical renunciation of Christianity, we follow Mr. Mac Farlane:—

‘All who serve the Dutch, or have any close dealings with them, are bound to take a solemn oath of renunciation and hatred of the Christian religion, once, twice, or even three times a-year; and, at least at one of

these ceremonies, they are made to trample under foot crosses and crucifixes, with the image of the Redeemer upon them. The ill-meant, mocking, impious jests of Voltaire, as to the Dutch going through the same ceremony, may not have been, at every period, quite destitute of truth. As Lutherans or Presbyterians they may have entertained no more reverence for crosses and crucifixes and images of saints, than was felt by our English Puritans, who, in the days of their prepotency, found a rude delight in destroying such articles, and treating them with every imaginable disrespect. The Portuguese, when driven to despair through their hated rivals, nearly involved the Dutch in their own ruin by announcing to the imperial government that they were Christians like themselves. It behoved the Dutch to convince the Japanese that there was the widest difference between them; that they belonged to a sect quite hostile to that of the Portuguese; that they hated Pope, Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, and all manner of monks and priests. We can, therefore, easily credit that, if put by the Japanese government to that test, the Dutchmen would not much scruple to trample upon the cross in the manner described by Voltaire. A bigoted Presbyterian would even find a pleasure in so doing. An old Nangasakian joke is, that a Dutchman, at the time of the great persecution, being surprised in some place by the Japanese police, and being asked whether he were a Christian, replied, "No! I am a Dutchman." We fear, indeed, that after any lengthened residence in the country, such religion as these Dutchmen carried with them was almost wholly evaporated. The life led in their prison at Nagasaki was little calculated to foster devotional feelings. Kämpfer says that in his time they lived like a set of heathens,—that the principles of Christianity were so little conspicuous in their lives and actions, that the Japanese were absurd in fearing that they would attempt the conversion of the heathens.—*Ibid.* pp. 57, 58.

After this Mr. Mac Farlane must have ventured upon a gentle jest, when he goes on to observe: 'But good and religious men have gone through this ordeal without any detriment to their faith or morals; so let not these remarks be taken as uncharitable, or as disrespectful to the Dutch.'

It is, perhaps, fortunate for us that we were never subjected to the like temptations. The history of the English commercial intercourse with Japan does not admit of abridgment, and it is curious as an almost solitary instance of English failure in trade:—

'Through the help and admirable diplomacy of Adams, a commercial treaty, or a series of privileges, more favourable than any ever enjoyed by Portuguese or by Dutch, was granted to the English, and apparently without any demur or delay on the part of the imperial court.

'The first article in these original privileges of 1613 runs thus:—"We give free license to the King of England's subjects, Sir Thomas Smith, Governor, and Company of the East India Merchants, for ever, safely to come *into any our ports* or empire of Japan, with their ships and merchandise, without hindrance to them or their goods; and to abide, buy, sell, and barter, according to their own manner with all nations; and to tarry so long as they will, and depart at their pleasure."

'The second article exempted English goods from all manner of customs or duties; the third granted to the English full freedom of building houses in any part of the empire, which houses, at their departure, they might freely sell; the fourth article placed the property of any English subject that might die in the empire under the sole control of the captain, merchant, or English resident, and exempted entirely all English subjects, whatever their offences, from the somewhat summary process of Japanese

law; and the three remaining articles were all in the same liberal and most friendly spirit.

These privileges were, however, somewhat modified in 1616, when the English, wherever they might arrive on the coast, were ordered to repair immediately to the port and town Firando, there to sell their merchandise, and not to stay at, or trade, in any other port whatsoever. But it was ordered at the same time, that, in case of contrary winds or bad weather, the English ships might abide in any other port, without paying anchorage duties; and the people were enjoined to treat such ships in a friendly manner, and to sell them whatsoever they might require. At the same time, all the other valuable privileges of 1613 were confirmed. Captain Cock, who established himself at Firando, and remained in the country long after the departure of Saris, paid more than one visit to the imperial court at Jeddo.

Our factory at Firando, or rather, perhaps, those who managed their shipments in England, made an injudicious selection of merchandise, sending out commodities which were not in request in that country. In this manner the trade was conducted, rather at a loss than profit; and this, with some other circumstances of discouragement, induced the East India Company prematurely to abandon the experiment.

"Of the English," says a recent English writer, (Rundall,) "it is simply to be observed, that in their commercial project they failed, and that they retired with honour, and regretted, from the scene of their misadventure." In the year 1623, after upwards of 40,000*l.* had been uselessly expended, they entirely withdrew from that country and trade.—*Ibid.* pp. 66—69.

From that time to the present the Japanese have maintained their policy, not, as we have said, without justification. And we have been thus minute in our historical statement, because we doubt whether here or in the United States much is known of the antecedents of the present state of things in Japan.

We were attracted to the name of Japan, chiefly on account of the commercial interests involved in the proposed American expedition to these islands. Proposed, we say, for we have not heard much of it lately. If this expedition is undertaken as one of aggression, we cannot doubt but that the Americans, fertile in expedients for aggrandisement, will find some occasion for mortal quarrel with the poor islanders. One presents itself *in limine*: it is the practice of the Japanese authorities to surround all foreign ships on their arrival with a triple circle of guard-boats. A ship-of-war may not unreasonably regard this as an insult. A *casus belli* is at once established; and a pretext for a collision given. A lesson is to be read: the Japanese towns are battered, and immense destruction of life and property ensues. The local authorities, military and civil, are held responsible at the seat of government. With one consent they all rip up their bowels—the prescribed method of suicide—in atonement for neglect of duty. The Americans occupy and retain an island on the coast: the old story between China and England is repeated, and free-trade and the Gospel once more enter Japan, through seas of blood. Whether in either case, that of China or Japan, the best course is adopted, either for

recommending our commercial policy or our religion in these places may be questioned.

But having reached Japan, we may as well survey the mysterious region to which an isolated circumstance has transferred some share of public curiosity. The islands forming the combined Japanese and Kurile archipelago are of considerable length, and very scanty width. Adopting Humboldt's parallel view of the original conformation of the Atlantic islands as the summits of a submerged chain of mountains, it seems not improbable that a similar origin may be given to the Japanese group, which is only a single member of a prolonged chain of volcanic peaks, ranging from Kamschatka through the Aleutian, Japanese and Philippine Islands, down to the southern tropic. They are all volcanic,—indeed, some are active volcanoes; and they present an axis more or less parallel with that of the coast. "This gives a great diversity of climate; and, as is well known, by the variation in the isothermal lines, the cold region comes down very far on the eastern coast of Asia. The Japanese possessions, therefore, range from a semi-tropical climate to one approaching to that of Kamschatka. We read of the bamboo as indigenous to Japan, and most extensively used; the camphor-tree and tea-tree are grown in the most southern island, but the Kurile islands, to which the empire extends, have no better climate than that of Norway. This accounts for the very different terms in which travellers describe Japan,—at one time as the chosen seat of fog and frost and storm, at another, as equal to the garden of the Hesperides.

Mr. Mac Farlane, in what he says of the physical geography of Japan, is neither scientific nor consecutive. Indeed, in the absence of any detailed account, we are left to pick up such information from the most scanty and scattered intimations of various writers. At Nagasaki, the southern port, the thermometer is said to range between 35° and 98° Fahrenheit. At Jeddo, the capital, snow falls every year. The population of this place was once reckoned at 2,000,000. It is doubtless a large place, and larger because it is built after the old Oriental type, in which, as in the interior cities of China, as we learn from Mr. Fortune, vast open spaces are enclosed within the walls.

There is a largeness and roundness in the older oriental descriptions, which certainly satisfies the mind and fills it with a composing sense of breadth and magnitude. Japan, as described, is no exception. Everything seems to be on the most imposing scale. Miaco, the ecclesiastical capital, contains precisely, we are assured, 6000 temples. Marco Polo, speaking of Japan, which he dignifies with the sonorous name of Zipangu,

assures us that the great 'palace was roofed with gold considerably thick,—covered with it as we cover churches with lead.' The palace of the Kobo with its gardens is, we are assured, eight miles in circumference: this palace must be of the same aspect as that which

'In Xanadu did Kublai Khan
A stately pleasure-house decree,
Where Alph, the sacred river, ran.'

But there are no rivers of any size in Japan; the narrowness of the islands and the general bearing of the elevation preventing it. The Fudsi Jamma, compared to the Pico in Teneriffe, is the highest volcanic peak, and is said to be 12,000 feet high; the height indeed of the Pico—which is only 3,000 feet short of that of Mont Blanc. It cannot be so high as this, for the Dutch speak of 'the snow seldom melting on it.' We conceive that in such a climate as that of Jeddo, near which the mountain is laid down in the maps, the line of perpetual snow must be below 12,000 feet. The largest island, Nippon, is in length 900 miles; the greatest width of any of the group is about 100 miles.

The government of Japan is remarkable: it recalls the double kings of Sparta—dare we say of Brentford? There is a Secular Emperor, the Kobo, and an Ecclesiastical Emperor, the Mikado or Dairi, who reign co-ordinately. Such at least is the common account; but one which we cannot assent to put in this vague way. The government was a sort of theocracy, because an especial sanctity was attached to the person who reigned. In all early states of society the sacerdotal and kingly offices were considered identical. The emperor ruled by divine right and by inheritance, and was the representative descendant of the gods; we do not find, as in the later developments of Buddhism, that he was an incarnation of the Divinity. In fact, this latter view (the Thibetan) may only have arisen from the literal translation of a metaphor. But as in Thibet so in Japan, the theocracy was a convenient theory for the aristocracy of the sacerdotal caste. The emperor in Japan, or the Dalai Lama in Thibet, seems to lead the life of the Lucretian gods. The Mikado lives shut up in his palace, 'with one wife and twelve concubines, plenty of paper, books, and music.' But the dignity is dreary enough.

"Even to this day," says Kämpfer, "the princes descended from the family, more particularly those who sit on the throne, are looked upon as persons most holy in themselves, and as Popes by birth. And, in order to preserve these advantageous notions in the minds of their subjects, they are obliged to take an uncommon care of their sacred persons, and to do such things, which, examined according to the customs of other nations, would be thought ridiculous and impertinent. It will not be improper to give a few instances. The ecclesiastical emperor thinks that it would be very prejudicial to his dignity and holiness to touch the ground with his feet: for this reason, when he intends to go anywhere, he must be carried

thither on men's shoulders. Much less will they suffer, that he should expose his sacred person to the open air; and the sun is not thought worthy to shine on his head. There is such a holiness ascribed to all parts of the body, that he dares to cut off neither his hair, nor his beard, nor his nails. However, lest he should grow too dirty, they may clean him in the night when he is asleep; because, they say, that what is taken from his body at that time hath been stolen from him, and that such a theft doth not prejudice his holiness or dignity. In ancient times, he was obliged to sit on the throne for some hours every morning, with the imperial crown on his head, but to sit altogether like a statue, without stirring either hands or feet, head or eyes, nor indeed any part of his body, because, by this means, it was thought that he could preserve peace and tranquillity in his empire; for if, unfortunately, he turned himself on one side or the other, or if he looked a good while towards any part of his dominions, it was apprehended that war, famine, fire, or some other great misfortune, was near at hand to desolate the country. But it having been afterwards discovered, that the imperial crown was the palladium which, by its immobility, could preserve peace in the empire, it was thought expedient to deliver his imperial person, consecrated only to idleness and pleasure, from this burthensome duty, and therefore the crown, alone, is at present placed on the throne for several hours every morning. His victuals must be dressed every time in new pots, and served at table in new dishes: both are very clean and neat, but made only of common clay, that, without any considerable expense, they may be laid aside, or broken, after they have served once. They are generally broken, for fear they should come into the hands of laymen; for they believe religiously, that if any layman should presume to eat his food out of these sacred dishes, it would swell and inflame his mouth and throat. The like ill effect is dreaded from the Dairi's sacred habits; for they believe that if a layman should wear them, without the emperor's express leave or command, they would occasion pains in all parts of his body."—*Ibid.* pp. 171—173.

But what is really an exceptional case is, that this theocracy descends occasionally to females, and that the spiritual emperor may be, in short, an empress. The throne, when vacant, is filled by a nominee of the Council; that is, the Pope is elected by the Cardinals. Elected we say, for though the succession is nominally in a right line, yet the Council determines who is the nearest heir, which, in a country where polygamy is permitted, opens a large door to external interest.

The rise of the secular emperor seems to have been this:—Japan was a strictly feudal state; the separate dukes and counts, as we should call them, only paid a nominal obedience to the spiritual emperor. Then arose, as in Europe, the great struggle between the Suzerain and the independent holders of fiefs. We all know how it terminated in Europe, by the king calling into existence a burgher, or middle class, and throwing himself on the municipalities. The kings of France and England dissolved the powerful confederacies of the nobles—in Japan matters took the opposite course. In feudal countries there will always be some prominent baron, some Warwick or the like, who holds the real sway. He commands the army in the West—in

the East he is Vizier. It requires but a single step to make the office of Mayor of the Palace hereditary ; this process was effected in Japan, and the Ziogun, the officer who held this dignity, though he did not at first assume the imperial name, soon acquired all the real power of the empire. The first Ziogun assumed office about the middle of the twelfth century, so that some strange political affinity and change in social relations was working on the Seine and in Nippon at the same time. He was not then, nor is he now, theoretically joint emperor with the Daïri ; he is only the secular king. He held all the real power, but a certain theoretical supremacy is reserved to the Daïri, or Mikado, the ecclesiastical emperor. It was not till 1585 that the title Ziogun, General-in-Chief, was expanded into that of Kobo, which is the present appellation of the (so-called) secular emperor. It is only in this sense that Japan has two emperors ; that Church and State both bear imperial sway, and that a conjoint, yet separate dynasty, celestial and terrestrial, rules without collision or interference. Curiously enough, the fate which overtook the Daïri has pursued the Kobo ; the lay and spiritual emperors are both reduced to shadows, the sovereignty either of Church or State is merely ideal and fictitious ; the Daïri sleeps away his torpid existence at Miaco, the self-torturing shadow of departed greatness, while the Kobo is immersed in dignified, but unauthoritative, seclusion in his palace at Jeddo. The charmed slumbers of the famous king in the 'Sleeping Beauty,' are the only parallel for the imperial state of Japan.

We must, however, remark, that the political history of Japan, since the expulsion of the Portuguese, is very scanty. This principle of dualism, which the lay and clerical empires present, is said, with what truth we know not, to pervade other Japanese institutions.

It remains to give some account of the religion of Japan, which, from the extremely perplexed and conflicting statements on the subject, is far from easy. The recognised religion, as we said, is Sintoism, though it would be hard to say what Sintoism is. The Japanese, however, seem to have solved the problem which causes so much trouble to European states. There is an established religion, and there is the most perfect toleration—purchased, as such a system only can be purchased, by an entire surrender of principle on every side. The Kobo sends an embassy, or goes on a pilgrimage to his ecclesiastical elder brother, the Sintoo Emperor, and at the same time builds a Buddhist temple ; while the Daïri, the prince and priest of Sintoism, allows the easy importation of strange gods into the sacred temples of his own faith. In fact, it is the height of

politeness for different religious professors to attend the worship of the gods of their friends. The only thing, as of old, which is proscribed, is Christianity; neither the Japanese nor the Roman empire would refuse the Cross its intercommunion in rites. It is the exclusiveness of the Gospel which is its scandal.

Sintooism was perhaps originally a form of Sabæanism; its chief divinity is the Goddess of the Sun. She is worshipped through the mediation of inferior gods and deified mortals. Some doctrine of a future state, and of rewards and punishments, is retained; but the actual duties of religion consist in, 1, Preservation of pure fire; 2, Purity of the heart and body; 3, The observance of festival days; 4, Pilgrimage; and, 5, The public and private *cultus* of the inferior gods and saints—the Kami. These last seem to be the ordinary Teraphim of the eastern, and Penates of classical worship. The temple and domestic worship is thus described:—

‘The religious observances on festival days appear to be very simple and very short. The worshipper, clad in his best clothes, approaches the temple, performs his ablutions at a tank, kneels in the veranda opposite a grated window, through which he can fix his eyes on the mirror; he then offers up his prayers, and a sacrifice of rice, fruit, tea, sackee, or the like; deposits a little money in a box, and takes his departure, to spend the rest of the day in sports and pastimes, or in the manner he thinks best. According to Kämpfer, they conclude their ceremonies at the temple by striking three times upon a bell, which is hung over the door, believing the gods to be highly delighted with the sounds of musical instruments. “All this being done, they retire, to divert themselves the remaining part of the day with walking, exercises, sports, eating and drinking, and treating one another to good things.” The temple must not be approached with a downcast spirit or a sorrowful countenance, for that might disturb the placid beatitude of the Kami.’—*Ibid.* pp. 209, 210.

The domestic rites of the ancient and dominant Japanese religion are not well known. If Siebold, from whom the account is taken, is to be trusted, the last sentence, apart from its awkward phraseology, in the following extract is very curious:—

‘At home in every Sintoo house, each meal is preceded by a short prayer, and in nearly every garden or courtyard attached to such house, there is a miniature mya, or temple. The Sintoo priests are called *Kami-Nusi*, or the hosts or landlords of the gods; they dwell in houses built within the grounds attached to the temples. The money deposited by the worshippers goes into their purse, and the oblations of rice, fruit, tea, and the rest, go to their kitchen and table. They have thus the means of hospitality, and are said to exercise it liberally to strangers. The Dutch, however, always found, that in their case, a return in solid cash was expected, and that these temple-visits were very expensive. Celibacy is no tenet of the Sintoo; the Kami-Nusi marry, and their wives are priestesses, to whom specific rites and duties are allotted. It appears that they act as god-

mothers general to all the female children of their sect that are born in Japan, giving them their names, sprinkling them with water, and performing other ceremonies."—*Ibid.* pp. 210, 211.

We need hardly remark, that the parallel which Mr. Mac Farlane seems to suggest between what he calls the Japanese Pilgrimages and the Romanist devotion to shrines, is singularly inaccurate. The sacred regulation of the law for all the males to appear at Jerusalem, is a closer parallel. However, as the writer whom we have hitherto followed has compiled with general accuracy, we may take his facts apart from his inferences:—

‘Pilgrimage is the grand and most sanctifying act of Sintoo devotion. There are no fewer than twenty-two shrines in different parts of the empire, which are frequented annually, or more frequently by the devout. The most conspicuous, and most honoured of all—the very Loretto of the Japanese,—is Isye, with its ancient temple of Ten-sio-dai-zin, or the Sun Goddess. The principal temple is surrounded by nearly a hundred small ones, which have little else of a temple than the mere shape, being, for the most part, so low and narrow, that a man can scarcely stand up in them. Each of these temples, or little chapels, is attended by a priest. Near to them live multitudes of priests and functionaries, who call themselves the messengers of the gods, and who keep houses and lodgings to accommodate travellers and pilgrims. . . . The principal temple itself is a very plain, unpretending edifice, and evidently of great antiquity, though not quite so old as the priests and devotees pretend. According to the latter, the Sun Goddess was born in it and dwelt in it, and on that account it has never been enlarged, improved, or in any way altered. Among the priestesses of the temple, there is almost always a daughter of a spiritual emperor.

“Orthodox Sintonists,” says Kämpfer, “go in pilgrimage to Isye once a-year, or at the very least once in their lifetime; nay, it is thought a duty incumbent on every true patriot, whatever sect or religion he otherwise adheres to, and a public mark of respect and gratitude which every one ought to pay to the Sun Goddess, as to the protectress, founder, and first parent of the Japanese nation. . . . This pilgrimage is made at all times of the year; but the greatest concourse of people is in their three first months, March, April, and May, when the season of the year and the good weather make the journey very agreeable and pleasant. Persons of all ranks and qualities, rich and poor, old and young, men and women, resort thither; the lords only of the highest quality, and the most potent princes of the empire excepted, who seldom appear there in person.

“An embassy from the emperor is sent there once every year, in the first month, at which time also another with rich presents goes to Miaco with presents to the ecclesiastical hereditary monarch. Most of the princes of the empire follow the emperor’s example.”—*Ibid.* pp. 211—213.

We cannot say, however, that when we read that the certificate of having appeared at the sacred shrine is considered as a plenary remission, and that in the available form of a piece of printed paper it is sold, with all its virtues, to all who can afford to pay for it, and who do not choose to go to the expense in time and trouble of a personal visit to Isye, we are forcibly

reminded of the abuses connected with the system of indulgences.

What the ordinary writers on Japan think proper to call religious orders and monasteries, are only the Buddhist Lamacovics, which the readers of our recent paper on M. Huc's Travels are not likely to have forgotten. A society of female devotees, whom Kämpfer thinks proper to compare with the nuns, or at least, Beguines of Europe, 'of no particular faith, and of very doubtful morality,' much more pointedly resembles the devotees of Mylitta in the temples of Babylon.

Japan, however, like China, seems to have passed its culmination. In religion, as well as in arts, these great mysterious countries are on the decline. The popular superstitions seem to have a very slight hold on the vulgar mind; Buddhism has the strongest, but, perhaps, because it is a double system, presenting a vague Pantheizing philosophy for the initiated, and the most sordid idolatry for the lower classes. The accounts seem to combine in representing the apparently inconsistent facts, that all religious persons, priests and the like, are the objects of popular ridicule and contempt, and yet that the temples and shrines are well attended, and supplied with pecuniary support. It is even doubtful whether, in the extreme East, an individual ever prays, or has any personal belief in God; his religion is simply and nakedly vicarious; it is the business of the priest, or Lama, to pray for him, or to grind out prayers in the Thibetan Prayer-mill. If he pays for this he thinks that he may safely despise the instrument of his devotions; so long as he gets his religion done for him, he has no further concern with it. In some such way as this, the conflicting accounts which we read of Chinese and Japanese religion, must be understood; for it is common in popular works to describe them both as a religious people, and as entire atheists.

It would be quite superfluous in this place to give any detail of the philosophic religion of Japan—the *Suto* or 'way of the philosophers'—because it is only the abstract and mystical esoteric Buddhism, which, perhaps, scarcely differs from the Indian and kindred Pantheism. The high spiritualistic Oriental philosophers differ rather in terminology, and not much in that, than in ideas. They believe, generally, or affect to believe, in a universal soul and spirit, sustaining but not creative, which is diffused through the universe and animates all things, which absorbs souls and intelligences as the ocean receives the rivers and waters. This is the philosophic faith which the educated classes in Japan, as throughout the East, affect to hold. They conform to the popular religious observances by way of exam-

ple, and as thinking it better that the vulgar should profess, or conform to idolatry, rather than to nothing.

The public worship of Buddhism is well described by Mr. Fortune in his elegant and instructive volume, 'The Tea Districts of China':—

'Anxious to see the whole of the Buddhist service, I took my station at one of the passages leading to the large temple a few minutes before the priests assembled. I had not been there long before an old priest walked past me to a huge block of wood, carved in the form of a fish, which was slung from the roof of one of the passages. This he struck several times with a wooden pole, and a loud hollow sound was given out which was heard over all the building. The large bronze bell in the belfry was now tolled three times; and the priests were observed coming from all quarters, each having a yellow robe thrown over his left shoulder. At the same time an old man was going round, beating on a piece of square board, to awake the priests who might be asleep, and to call the lazy ones to prayer.

'The temple to which the priests were hurrying, was a large building, fully 100 feet square, and about 60 feet in height. Its roof was supported by numerous massive wooden pillars. Three large idols—the Past, the Present, and the Future, each at least 30 feet in height—stood in the middle of the temple. An altar was in front of them, and more than a hundred hassocks were on the floor in front of the altar for the priests to kneel on during the service. Ranged on each side of this spacious hall were numerous idols of a smaller size, said to be the representatives of deified kings, and other great men, who had been remarkable for piety during their lifetime.

'Entering with the priests, I observed a man lighting the candles placed upon the altar, and burning incense. The smoke of the incense as it rose in the air filled the place with a heavy yet pleasing perfume. A solemn stillness seemed to pervade the temple. The priests came in one by one, in the most devout manner, scarcely lifting their eyes from the ground, and arranged themselves on the right and left sides of the altar, kneeling on the hassocks, and bending down lowly several times to the idols. Again the large bell tolled,—slowly and solemnly at first, then gradually quicker; and then everything was perfectly still.

'The priests were now all assembled, about eighty in number, and the services of the temple began. I took a seat near the door. The priest nearest to the altar now rang a small bell, another struck a drum, and the whole eighty bent down several times upon their knees. One of them then struck a round piece of wood, rather larger than a man's skull, and hollow inside, alternately with a large bronze bell. At this stage of the ceremonies, a young priest stepped out from amongst the others, and took his station directly in front of the altar, bowing lowly and repeatedly as he did so. Then the hymn of praise began. One of the priests, apparently the leader, kept time by beating upon the hollow piece of wood, and the whole of the others sang or chanted the service in a most mournful key. At the commencement of the service, the priests who were ranged in front of the altar, half on the right side and half on the left, stood with their faces to the large images. Now, however, they suddenly wheeled round and faced each other. The chanting, which began slowly, increased in quickness as it went on, and when at the quickest part suddenly stopped. All was then silent for a second or two. At last, a single voice was heard to chant a few notes by itself, and then the whole assembly joined, and went on as before.

'The young priest who had come out from amongst the others now took

his station directly in front of the altar, but near the door of the temple, and bowed lowly several times upon a cushion placed there for that purpose. He then walked up to the altar with slow and solemn steps, took up a vessel which stood on it, and filled it with water. After making some crosses and gyrations with his hand, he sprinkled a little of the water upon the table. When this was done, he poured a little from the vessel into a cup, and retired slowly from the altar towards the door of the temple. Passing outside, he dipped his fingers in the water and sprinkled it on the top of a stone pillar which stood near the door.

* While this was going on the other priests were still chanting the service. The time of the music frequently changed:—now it was fast and lively,—now slow and solemn,—but always in a plaintive key. This part of the service being ended, all knelt lowly before the altar, and when they rose from their knees a procession was formed. The priests on the right of the altar filed off to the right, and those on the left to the left, each walking behind the other up the two sides of the spacious hall, and chanting as they went a low and solemn air, time being kept by the tinkling of a small bell. When the two processions met at the further end of the building, each wheeled round and returned in the same order as it came. The procession lasted for about five minutes, and then the priests took up their stations in front of the altar, and the chanting went on as before. A minute or two after this the whole body fell upon their knees, and sang for a while in this posture. When they rose, those on the left sang a part of the service by themselves, then knelt down. The right side now took up the chant, and, having performed their part, also knelt down. The left side rose again, and so they went on for ten minutes, prostrating themselves alternately before the altar. The remainder of the service was nearly the same as that at the commencement.

‘This striking ceremony had now lasted for about an hour. During the whole time a thick screen had been hanging down in front of the large door, to keep out the sun’s rays. Just before the conclusion of the service the curtain was drawn aside, and a most striking and curious effect was produced. Streams of ruddy light shot across the temple, the candles on the altar appeared to burn dimly, and the huge idols seemed more massive and strange than they had done before. One by one the priests slowly retired as solemnly as they came, and *apparently* deeply impressed with the services in which they had been engaged. Nearly all the priests adjourned to the refectory, where dinner was served immediately. The Buddhists eat no animal food; but they manage to consume a very large quantity of rice and vegetables. I have been perfectly astonished at the quantity of rice eaten by one of these priests at a meal. And yet, generally, they look poor and emaciated beings, which is probably owing as much to the sedentary lives which they lead as to the nature of their food.’—*Tea Districts of China*, pp. 304—309.

It has been said or thought, that the toleration of different sects is a promising omen for missionary work in Japan: and it has actually been proposed, should an entrance ever be forced or yielded in the great barrier against national intercourse which these singular islands have for so many centuries maintained, that the Christian Missionaries should place themselves under the protection of the spiritual Emperor. If, it is said, Christianity would come down from its transcendental and exclusive position, if it would renounce the right of total inde-

pendence, the cross might once more triumph over the centimaneous deities of Buddhism. Now we are far from saying that the Portuguese mission was without its faults, or that we should not do well, did the occasion offer, entirely to avoid that interference with secular politics, which, sooner or later, becomes the bane of all Jesuit missions; and through which in Japan, the Church planted by Xavier fell. But there are two especial difficulties connected with any Japanese Mission. In recognising the government of the country, and in submitting to its ordinances, it is difficult to see how a mission could distinguish between the co-ordinate secular and ecclesiastical authorities. While the Mikado or Daïri claims to be the son and representative of Deity, so long as the spiritual Emperor is not only protector of the sects but himself inherits the theocracy, so long as an innate holiness is ascribed to his person, and so long as he claims to exercise the attributes of Divinity, the power of causing famine and pestilence, and the like, it seems all but impossible for any Christian Mission to recognise the Mikado at all, or his authority.

The separation of the state authority into two (theoretically) independent functions, and the necessity of recognising both, is then one especial difficulty in the way of evangelizing Japan; and it is one of recent growth, for in Xavier's days it had not taken its present definite form. Add to this that Christianity has been tried and rejected: an apostate country is harder to reclaim than a simply heathen one. The Gospel is a savour of death unto death. It is hoped, however, that if Christianity were presented with simpler rites, and in direct antagonism to that form of it against which the Japanese are so prejudiced, 'a troop of reformed missionaries might again have a chance of success:' so we are told; but we must not forget that Japan has received and rejected the Gospel, under Roman Catholic auspices: it has in the person of the Dutch seen something of its reformed aspect. If the one has repelled, the other would not be likely to attract, either the philosophizing from his supersensual contemplations, or the vulgar from his sensual idolatries. The Christians of Xavier's church might provoke a popular tumult, by insulting the *Dii minorum gentium* of Sintoism or Buddhism: all that the Japanese know of Christianity, under any other form, is that presented by the Hollanders, who helped the Japanese idolaters to massacre the Japanese Christians. These are ill omens for the evangelization of Japan; and though we do not, and dare not, for a single moment, doubt of the ultimate success of our own Church, in the great work of Oriental missions, if fairly presented in its

own principles, yet what has already been detailed of Japan will serve to show what especial hindrances it must encounter, if the work of planting the cross in Nippon should be reserved for us,—or for our American brethren.

Of late years the subject of missions has been taken up with some better approaches to philosophy and common sense. But we shall never succeed in Missions, if we suppose that an ordinary gentleman, of less than ordinary capacity, with nothing to offer to the subtle professors of Brahmanism and Buddhism, than the Bible, and the Prayer Book, with its unvarying ritual, constructed for England, and English tastes, will make the least impression on the great Oriental mind. Few of our readers have, perhaps, realized the vastness of the system to be attacked; Buddhism and Brahmanism combined far exceed in numerical strength Christianity under its varied forms. The statistics of religion combine in representing Buddhism alone as nearly equalling the Gospel in point of numbers: some accounts give Buddhism a clear superiority. The ordinary computation of the population of the globe, according to religious profession—we take that adopted by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel—is:—

Christians	260,000,000
Jews	4,000,000
Mahometans	96,000,000
Idolaters of all sorts . . .	500,000,000=860,000,000

This table does not vary very fatally from the more scientific enumeration furnished by Mr. Keith Johnstone, in his 'Physical Atlas,' which, adopting the above method of division, would stand thus:—

Christians	286,000,000
Jews	5,500,000
Mahometans	116,000,000
Idolaters	484,000,000=891,000,000

It is frightful, however, to remember, that this awful aggregate of the sum of idolaters, is made up, according to Mr. Johnstone, in particulars of—

Buddhists	245,000,000
Brahmanists	133,000,000
Pagans	106,000,000=484,000,000

An unauthoritative and anonymous table, given by Mr. Mac Farlane, shows still more alarming proportions: we believe them to be an exaggerated statement of Oriental religion:—

Mahometans	252,000,000
Buddhists	315,000,000
Brahmanists	111,000,000

But anyhow, we have nearly four hundred millions of religionists not strictly worshippers of wood and stone, but under its Brahmanical and Buddhist varieties, professors of a religion which claims to have a deep and commanding philosophy, which numbers educated and thoughtful men in its ranks, which is old, venerable, full of great associations, and abounding in lofty pretensions. Against all this we have to offer Christianity, externally crippled, and internally weakened by divisions. In the plenitude of his heathen scorn, when the Japanese emperor was once asked to proscribe Christianity, he replied, 'We have already thirty-four sects of our own; the Christians will make the thirty-fifth; this will do no great harm; let them remain.' But when Christianity is next proffered to the proud feudality of Japan, it will not be in the shape of a thirty-fifth faith, one compact and intelligible, but in the perplexing form of twice thirty-five denominations of Christians, repeating with exaggerations the terrible warning of the strife between Portuguese and Dutch. The enmity between two bodies of Christian professors destroyed Japanese Christianity once; what we have next to try is, whether the Japanese will be indifferent to the sight of eight or ten rival Missions, all proclaiming the Gospel, and all 'thoroughly convinced,' and thoroughly proclaiming their convictions, 'of the difference between the Church of Rome, and the reformed Churches.' To this obstacle we must reconcile ourselves as we may; it is one common in days of division, to every Church, and to 'all denominations;' it is no especial hindrance to the Church of England. We make up our minds to it, and expect it, and fight it as we can. All that we can do is either to face it, or to abandon missionary work altogether.

There remain, however, certain specialties, which account for the little success which our recent Missions have had in grappling with the Oriental mind. We do not undervalue the Tinnevely successes, and the like; they are, however, recent and partial. And they, which is most thankworthy, show that 'the common people hear the Gospel gladly.' But as regards the great labyrinth of Indian metaphysics, and Buddhist theosophy, have we penetrated even the outskirts of the jungle? What impression has been made upon those hundreds of millions of souls? Can we expect any impression? Passing by that deadliest curse upon missionary purposes, the evil lives of Christian professors, what machinery have we to grapple with the systematic unbelief of the East? What with Islam?

It is comparatively easy for very common-place people, and with very ordinary means, to displace Fetichism, or to substitute the worship of Almighty God for that of a black stone; but

confront a missionary of the ordinary 'Society'-stamp with a great religion, which professes the loftiest doctrines and the purest principles of abstract morality—which preaches the beauty and holiness of self-sacrifice—which inculcates the necessity of prayer without ceasing, and the deepest meditation upon spiritual mysteries—which is ascetic and charitable—which commands self-examination and the most minute watchfulness over every thought, and deed, and word, and work; and all that we can say is, that he requires a very different training from what among ourselves he receives. The foundation of S. Augustine's College has led to some expectations of an improved state of things. We believe that these expectations will not be disappointed; but beyond this admirable institution we have a right to scrutinise every quarter where aid can be legitimately demanded. There is a Sanscrit professorship, and there are Sanscrit scholarships at Oxford. It is not unfair to inquire, what assistance the Church has derived from these endowments, in coping with Buddhism in the strongholds of its influence and successes? We say it without bitterness or contempt; but what can be expected from a divine of the calibre of Bishop Smith, of Victoria, who has only signalised himself by squabbling with the American missionary bishop, Dr. Boone, about precedence and jurisdiction? What we want—and to supply the want we can never begin too early—is a body of men of the highest education, who shall be able to grapple with refined infidelity of the most specious forms in Benares, Canton, and Jeddo.

A story is told somewhere of a resolution, which some well-meaning persons came to for converting Southern India by a liberal distribution of Butler's Analogy in the vernacular, having failed by the preliminary difficulty of universal ignorance as to what was the Tamil for analogy. It is a fact, that after some years of Anglo-Saxon missions at Hong Kong, the American and English missionaries cannot settle, either for themselves or each other, the Chinese word for God, in its Christian sense. Such difficulties are not confined to a single theological term. The instance is adduced only to show that the very highest education, and the greatest intellectual powers of Europe, will be taxed, when they enter into controversy with the higher forms of Oriental religion.

Neither will it help the Missionary cause if the way to Jeddo is opened by British or American steamers and cannon. The Japanese, as a people, we believe, regret the policy which shuts their ports to European civilization and European trade. Much, however, as in their hearts they might welcome the downfall of

the moribund political system, which estranges Japan; we question whether the propagation of the Gospel would be benefited by its connexion with bloodshed and revolution. It is a misfortune that the English Church must be in Chinese eyes connected with the opium war; not a misfortune that the Bishopric of Victoria was founded as soon as we settled at Hong Kong; but a deep and abiding misfortune, that the first which was heard in so many Chinese provinces of England, was in connexion with the Nemesis, and 'the devil's ships.' The Gospel of Peace and a British broadside are hard things for the Chinese intellect to reconcile.

However, we are venturing on subjects perplexing, if not painful; we will therefore turn to a more promising aspect of the Japanese character, and, as it is connected with our last observations, some account of Japanese learning, and of the general diffusion of education, will not be out of place:—only premising that the Japanese language is monosyllabic,¹ that paper made of bark is said to have been used as early as the seventh century, and that the art of printing from engraved wooden blocks is some centuries older than its European invention or introduction.

'From the moment the Japanese acquired a written language, their literature advanced rapidly, and it appears to have improved from age to age. Unfortunately, in Europe, it is scarcely known; but from the few Japanese books that have fallen into the hands of learned foreigners, and from the accounts left us by the Missionaries and other travellers, it is evident that these people possess works of all kinds,—historical compositions, geographical and other scientific treatises, books on natural history, voyages and travels, moral philosophy, cyclopædias, dramas, romances, poems, and every component part of a very polite literature.

'The wide diffusion of education, which has been more than once mentioned, is of no recent date. The first of all the Missionaries who visited the country found schools established wherever they went. The sainted Xavier mentions the existence of four "Academies" in the vicinity of Miako, at each of which education was afforded to between three and four thousand pupils; adding, that considerable as these numbers were, they were quite insignificant in comparison with the numbers instructed at an institution near the city of Bandone; and that such institutions were universal throughout the empire.

'Nor does it appear that these institutions have decreased in modern days. Speaking of the early part of the present century, M. Meylan states that children of both sexes and of all ranks are invariably sent to rudimentary schools, where they learn to read and write, and are initiated into some knowledge of the history of their own country. To this extent, at least, it is considered necessary that the meanest peasant should be

¹ A Jesuit once said of it, that it must have been invented, and invested with the utmost difficulty by Satan himself, in order to drive poor Missionaries mad, and hinder the progress of the faith.

educated. Our officers, who visited the country as late as the year 1845, ascertained that there existed at Nagasaki a college, in which, additionally to the routine of native acquirements, foreign languages were taught. Among the visitors on board our ship, many spoke Dutch. Some understood a little French. One young student understood English slightly, could pronounce a few English words, caught readily at every English expression that struck him, and wrote it down in his note-book. They all seemed to be tolerably well acquainted with geography, and some of them appeared to have some acquaintance with guns, and the science of gunnery. The eagerness of all of them to acquire information greatly delighted our officers.

‘The Japanese printers keep the market well supplied with cheap, easy books, intended for the instruction of children, or people of the poorer classes. The editions or impressions of books of a higher order appear to be uncommonly numerous. Most of these books are illustrated and explained with frequent woodcuts, which are engraved on the same wood-blocks with the type. Like the Chinese, they only print on one side of their thin paper. An imperial cyclopædia, printed at Miako, in the spiritual emperor’s palace, is most copiously embellished with cuts.

‘All are agreed that reading is a favourite resource and recreation with both sexes, and that the Dairi, or court of the Mikado, is eminently a bookish, literary court.

‘It is said that few sights are more common in Japan, during the sunny seasons of the year, than that of a group of ladies and gentlemen seated by a cool running stream, or in a shady grove, each with a book in hand. Whatever their literature may be, it is evident that it delights them, and that it has polished their manners.’—*Mac Farlane’s Japan*, pp. 372—375.

It is added, also, that every Japanese, of whatever rank, is sent to school. It is said that there are more schools in Japan than in any other country in the world; and that even the peasants and poorest persons can read;—that, contrary to oriental practice, the minds of the women are equally cultivated with those of the men. Many of their authors are female; and travellers are enthusiastic in praise of their courtly manners and refinement. The national vice, among the men, is incontinence; but female chastity is in universal esteem. We conclude with an account of the national amusements, which presents very pleasing elements of a high and almost incredible civilization:—

‘In the great world the young ladies find delight, at their social meetings, in every description of fine work, the fabrication of pretty boxes, artificial flowers, painting of fans, birds, and animals, pocket-books, purses, plaiting thread for the head-dress, all for the favourite use of giving as presents. Such employments serve to while away the long winter evenings. In the spring, on the other hand, they participate with eagerness in all kinds of out-door and rural amusements. Of these the choicest are afforded by the pleasure-boats, which, adorned with the utmost cost and beauty, cover their lakes and rivers. In the enjoyment of society and music, they glide in these vessels from noon till late in the night. . . .

‘This is an enjoyment which can only be shared under the advantages of such a climate and scenery; viz. the climate of Nice and the scenery of

Lugano. Their lakes and rivers are, after sunset, one blaze or illumination, as it were, with the brightly-coloured paper lanterns displayed in their vessels. They play meanwhile that game with the fingers, which has been perpetuated from classic times in Italy. A floating figure is also placed in a vase of water; as the water is stirred by the motion of the boat, the figure moves. The guests sing to the guitar the strain "Anata modamada,"—"He floats, he is not still," till at last the puppet rests opposite some one of the party, whom it sentences to drain the sackee bowl as the pleasing forfeit of the game. All this stands out in cheerful contrast to the dull debaucheries of the men, and the childish diversions of the women, among other oriental nations. The female sex, at least, have greatly the advantage over the scandal of the Turkish bath; and the man has, equally with the Turk, the resource of his pipe, in the intervals of those better enjoyments which the admission of the female sex into society affords him, and which are prohibited to the Mussulman.

'Assuredly, these are captivating, delicious pictures of life and manners.'—*Ibid.* pp. 329—331.

NOTICES.

MR. MASTERS has projected a new series—generally speaking, a new series is not much in favour with us—of which we augur well. It is to be devoted to biography: not, as it seems, so much in the way of a Hagio-graphy, but in a more practical and simple form. Dismissing legend, the lives proposed are to be rather those of practical persons, living in historical times, and illustrating by their virtues the religious life. The notion is good, and it is one the value of which, very early in the revival, was pointed out by one concerned in it, and which has been very inadequately and partially fulfilled by Mr. Newman's 'Lives of the English Saints.' We presume that the present collection will be partly original and partly selected. The volume, well-known and valued, 'The Life of James Bonnell, Esq.,' appears as the first volume of the series. We could have wished another inauguration, as the book is rather dull, and is already on the S. P. C. K.'s list.

The able—unusually able—writer of the 'Restoration of Belief,' (Macmillan,) will not expect any judgment of ours in the present stage of his argument. By the way, we should, as a mere matter of literary moment, regret were this author's practice of fragmentary publication followed; and it is one which in previous works he has adopted: we mean that a theological argument ought not to be delivered to the public in instalments, like Mr. Dickens' stories. It is unjust both to reader and writer.

A vigorous 'Sermon on Church Music,' (Masters,) by Mr. Gresley, has caught our attention. The preacher does not talk at random: and when he says from experience, that 'the choral service is one of the most effectual instruments for the conversion of sinners as well as for the perfection of saints,' (p. 10,) some prejudices ought to be arrested if not removed.

Mr. Bennett's 'Second Letter to Lord John Russell, in which some Debates in the last Parliament are considered,' (Cleaver,) most persons will think out of time. Mr. Bennett might either have met Mr. Horsman's attacks simultaneously with their appearance, or have left him where the session left him—in ignominy. To review the matter now is, we think, superfluous. We speak only of the time, not of the substance, of the publication, with most of which we are in general accord. To abridge the right of English Churchmen to attend foreign services is a purism as hypocritical as mischievous. But when Mr. Bennett goes on to say that it is absolutely unlawful to attend the worship of the so-called English chaplains in cities and towns where the Catholic Church in another branch is legally settled and has jurisdiction, many will part company with his argument. Admitting, for a moment, that the letter of the ancient Canons is with Mr. Bennett, yet it is obvious to observe that they were constructed during the entirety of a state of things which has ceased. As a fact, the gift of unity, external unity, has been withdrawn: as a fact, Mr. Bennett at least admits, the grace of sacraments survives in the fragments

of the broken Church. What then we have to seek for in the ancient Canons is whether any principle is contained in them which might meet the present state of things were it known, or could it have been known, to antiquity. The letter of antiquity does not help us. The royalty of Judah was simply forbidden in the old law, yet it was divinely recognised. Theocratic regulations then became, from the necessity of the case, suspended; they were of force as principles, not in details. They were modified by facts, though those facts were exceptional and anomalous, and had been proscribed. Here then is a state of things not provided for, which required an adaptation of the old letter. It would have been sin in a pious Israelite to have refused obedience to David, because theocracy was the unabrogated divine institution. Here is an actual case in Sacred History, which may lead us to understand how a broken and divided Church, though never contemplated, may, in the counsels of God, legitimately suspend certain canonical rules, which were not essentially normal, but only by accident imperative before the division, and which cannot therefore be binding in particulars under a new but false, yet permitted, state of things. Mr. Bennett is most happy and ingenious in his use of the attendance on foreign services by Dr. Townsend, Mr. Stowell, and their friends. We could have helped him to a more decisive instance: we once saw a prominent Protestant and English dignitary not only present at a Roman Catholic baptism, but hold a taper during the service. But Mr. Bennett does not get over the theoretical inconsistency: he, while abroad, regularly ministered in prayers and sacraments to himself and his own domestic party and personal friends, apart from the Roman Communion and Church. Any nomadic Chaplain may take the hint that his flock are for the time to him what Mr. Bennett's friends and companions were to him. We do not say that there is no distinction, but it is not one of canonical order. And this we say, even while admitting that English chapels on the continent are most objectionable—much in theory, but more in fact—and yet more, assuming that it is not a matter of clerical obligation to attend them.

Mr. Chancellor Harington's able argument against the Nag's Head Fable, 'The Succession of Bishops unbroken,' (Rivingtons,) has reached a second edition.

We are not exactly aware what unoccupied ground Mr. Whitaker's new Monthly Magazine, 'The Christian Student,' proposes to cover. If, however, it has a distinct aim and fulfils it, and it certainly desires to do so loyally, we shall sympathise with its success.

We select from single sermons two of especial merit; 'Christian Unity a Practical Christian Duty,' by Mr. Harness, of Knightsbridge, and 'Cost an Element of Sacrifice,' by Mr. Philip Hale, preached at Camberwell. (Whitaker.) Mr. Harness' sermons are an admirable specimen of style as well as substance, and why they are 'not published' we cannot conceive. Mr. Hale is known as an active and very diligent worker; he has done much, and attempted more, for Tenison's (mismanaged) Library, which is under his care. We are glad to welcome him as a parochial teacher.

The great dispute which is raging in the daily papers on the stability and solvency of Life Assurance Institutions, would seem to be one little

calculated for discussion in these pages. But, from experience, we know how sedulously the secretaries and touters for new policies set upon the clergy. There are, perhaps, more insurances effected on clerical lives than on those of any other class of British subjects: and, for various reasons, the clergy are more likely to be imposed upon. They know little of business, and from their small means are disposed to close with the offer of small premiums. We do not go to the extent of saying that no new offices are safe: but we say this distinctly,—that offices with the very largest business, and of the most confirmed security, are enabled to do little more than justice to the assured. But the expenses necessary for a small office, though they do not equal, yet approximate to, those of the largest. It follows, then, that if two offices could do all the business which it is now proposed to spread over twenty, eighteen twentieths of the business expenses are in fact contributed at the risk of the assured. In other words, offices which are unnecessary, are dangerous. That many of the existing concerns are insolvent there can be no question: if our advice, therefore, on such a subject is of any weight, we recommend the older Institutions. At any rate, before a young clergyman insures his life, let him read Mr. Christie's 'Letter to Mr. Henley,' (Edinburgh: Constable.)

Messrs. Longman have published a collection of 'Rounds and Catches,' which we welcome heartily. Everybody knows, and when they try to sing them everybody finds that everybody does not know, the traditional 'Three Blind Mice,' and 'White sand and grey sand,' &c. This cheap and unpretending publication supplies these and the like famous melodies within reach and within voice of all. Surely Harington's famous 'Twas you, Sir, 'twas you, Sir,' wears a new, and, we do not mind owning, uncalled-for adaptation in this collection. As a whole it bears evidence of unpretending research: at any rate, it brings together what was needed—the scattered tunes which no other publication, to our knowledge, has done, at least in this cheap form.

'De Zangschool: Keus van Gezangen voor de School en het Leven: door H. B. Waterkleyn, Professor te Leuven. Thienen: by P. J. Merckx, (*The Song School: Songs for School and Life: by H. B. Waterkleyn, Professor at Louvain.* Tirlmont: P. J. Merckx.) This is a rather curious example of the vernacular efforts which Rome is making in every part of Europe. It was not to be expected that Mechlin, one of her best regulated dioceses, should be behind-hand in the work; and it is highly creditable to the zeal of the Professors of Louvain that one of them should have become the 'Watts' of the movement. Here, for two-pence, we have thirty songs, with their music; the latter partly consisting of national melodies, partly of German airs. Here is a specimen of the words—the striking analogy between Flemish and English may interest such of our readers as have never seen the former language:—

'Ik geloof in God den Vader
Die door t' Woord geschapen heeft
Aerde en Hemel, en te gader
Al wat is, en al wat leeft;
En in Zynen een'gen Zone,
Jesus-Christus, onzen Heer;
Die uit's Hemels hoogen troone
Is gedaeld ter aerde neêr.'

'I believe in God the Father
Who, through the Word, shaped has
Earth and Heaven, and together
All that is, and all that lives:
And in His only Son,
Jesus Christ, our Lord,
Who, from Heaven's high throne
Is come down to earth.'

The thoroughly Wesleyan cadence of another hymn is really remarkable :—

'U minnen, Maria, gedenk ik altyd.
Myn heet zy, Maria, op nieuw U gewyd !
Wees myne bescheemster, Maria zoo rein !
O ! wees myne moeder, uw kind wil ik zyn.'

Having mentioned the Diocese of Mechlin (and that of Liège, under its late excellent Bishop, was at least on a par with it), we cannot but express our admiration of the indefatigable energy which the Cardinal Primate Sterckx throws into the affairs of his Church. One day we find his imprimatur to the noble Gregorian music which Hanicq is so incessantly pouring forth; next day, to one of the 'Little Catechisms of Malines,' which are beginning to be regarded as catechetical models in north-western Europe; directly afterwards, to a new volume of the *Theologia ad usum Seminarii Mechliniensis*: then, again, to such a most needful little book as *Instructions sur la manière de Baptiser les Enfants Nouveau-nés à l'usage des Accoucheurs et des Sages-Femmes*, approved also by the medical faculty of Louvain; and presently afterwards to its Flemish counterpart. Such energy contrasts strangely enough with the majority of Episcopal operations in England.

'Strife for the Mastery,' (Murray,) is the title of two Allegories. They are sumptuously printed, and excellently illustrated by some wood-cuts exhibiting rare artistic powers in an amateur. The tales themselves—but we have said our say about allegories, and if ladies will write them we are only glad that they embody principles as good as those in the volume before us.

'Sunlight in the Clouds,' (Mozley.) Much of what we have just said applies to this volume. It is a collection of religious tales written with considerable pathos and entire good taste. The successive appearance of such volumes, and so good, answers the difficulty that the market may be overstocked. If it were, they would not appear; and that they are in demand is in itself a good sign.

Bishop Forbes' 'Explanation of the Nicene Creed,' (Masters,) aims high, and secures its aim. Into a small and unassuming compass much of pure dogmatic theology is compressed, and we know no English work which fulfils the same object. We should have preferred a somewhat more technical form. The work is for students, and students ought always to be reminded that they are not perusing an essay or a disquisition, but mastering settled points. Systematic theology should not be presented in the essay form. If a stiff arrangement cannot escape the look of formality it is a step towards accuracy. We thank the writer for his acceptable publication.

Mr. William Jackson has brought together, into a single volume, his 'Stories and Catechising Illustrative of the Collects,' (Mozley.) The notion was ingenious, and we have spoken favourably of the series as it has progressed—to use an Americanism, which it seems impossible to eradicate from popular use. We are really quite surprised at the skilful variety which the illustrator has thrown on a subject apparently unpromising.

There is much that is calm and pleasing about Mr. Isaac Williams'

'Biography of Mr. R. A. Suckling, of Bussage,' (Masters.) The interest derived from the treatment of the subject, perhaps exceeds that of the subject itself. Still, Mr. Suckling's was the type of a life which ought to be known—with nothing great or striking about it, incapable of exercising a large influence on society, yet doing a great work, and the greater because the less prominent. Still quiet landscapes have a very important share in the great economy of things. The world is made up of unromantic home scenes. Mr. Suckling moved and worked among such. His power was over individuals, and by example; and his character was one of remarkable personal influence. It is well that the Church and the world should, by occasional pictures of such a life, be reminded of its secret but more efficient strength. Where it must be the exception to rival the saint or the hero of the Gospel, the life of the soldier trains while it teaches.

To criticise a book which everybody has read and formed a judgment upon seems quite superfluous; and to give an opinion on 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' may be thought an unnecessary intrusion. No reviewer can superciliously set aside the public verdict, and a book which sells by its hundred thousands must have some value, and some influence for good or for evil. As a work of art we cannot give a high estimate of Mrs. Stowe's production. With the single exception of *St. Clair*, which stands out with remarkable prominence as something like a definite moral conception, there is not a character which is not common-place and second-hand to a degree. There is a coldness and rigidity in the execution which betrays the copyist. The pathos of the tale is of a low order, because founded chiefly on the physical emotions. *Uncle Tom* is simply tedious; *Legree* unnatural; and *St. Clair's* wife only the typical fine lady of the circulating library. In depicting scenery the authoress fails; in drawing character, she makes the dramatic error of representing a class by its extreme cases. The Creole who reaches Canada is not above the melodramatic hero of a very minor theatre. And perhaps the most original sketch—that of *Topsy*—not uninfluenced by the exquisite creation of *Fenella*, and unpleasantly recalling a trace even of *Undine*, is entirely marred by her dismal and impossible mission as a Sunday-school teacher in Liberia. Of course, as answering a purpose which has a political as well as a humane end, the coarse brush and unscrupulous induction of Mrs. Stowe have told wonderfully; and there is quite enough of powerful writing, and a dangerous facility in agglomerating horrors, to account for much of its unquestionable, and, with serious deductions, its deserved success. A system which, even in a single case, can, without a violation of the statute law, produce these results, is of course simply accursed; but, even on Mrs. Stowe's statement, most of the cruelty depicted was, even in the Southern States, illegal. As a picture of the Slave-State life, it is exactly as true as a *Borgia* is a fair specimen of Christianity. This we hold to be a moral fault in a writer: and, to go further and to extend, as this book seems to do, the fact of American depravity in the treatment of slaves, as a proof of the absolute and entire unlawfulness of slavery—say in its Oriental form—is to betray a bad logic of the heart rather than the head. The curiosity of the book to ourselves is the strange picture it gives of Negro religion; but, from Mrs. Stowe's untrustworthiness in class painting, we know not how far she has drawn a

species from a variety, or even, to speak botanically, from a monster. As to the religious profession of the authoress, we fancy that we detect a serious error—it is that of making every charitable person a redeemer of others, by vicarious suffering; this is of course a subtle form of developed Socinianism. This is called 'the Christ-like character,' and is the repetition by man of, or rather his substitute for, the work of redemption. Our readers will not have missed this as the leading idea of Longfellow's 'Golden Legend.'

'Walks after Wild Flowers, or the Botany of the Bohereens,' (Van Voorst,) is by 'Mr. Richard Dowden (Richard).' This reduplication puzzles us. A more delightful monograph of the Botany of a single locality (Cork) it would be impossible to conceive: the writer's profuseness of quotation and illustration, chiefly poetical, is embarrassing, from its richness. Mr. Dowden is equally generous in his general anecdotes. Kindliness of character, a healthy and genial estimate of the moral value of a naturalist's studies, and a glowing, reverential feeling towards 'Him who has so clothed the flowers of the field,' belong to all the writers whom Mr. Van Voorst so pleasantly introduces to us. His publications are among the most delightful of the day, even to unscientific readers; and our Irish botanist takes a good rank in his publisher's corps. Some, indeed several, inaccuracies in the Latin and Greek, as we are disposed to be uncritical, we shall attribute to the press.

Mr. Evans' Sermons, preached at S. Andrew's, Wells Street, are styled 'Christianity in its homely Aspects,' (Masters.) Passing over the exact propriety of the phrase 'homely' as equivalent, which it is not, to domestic or personal, Mr. Evans' written sermons scarcely convey the familiar aspect which belongs to them in delivery. This volume is anything but a plain one; it is original and interesting—highly so—but not homely, in any sense. Mr. Evans' mind is rich in illustration; and he is pointed in expression, with a considerable range of thought; and the collection is far above the average. But his cast of character leads to occasional exaggeration: *ex. grat.* after p. 168, pointing out clearly and well the peculiar force of the remarkable expression, 'a weaned child,' he goes on with this language, and we question whether it can be reconciled with physiological, or rather physical, facts: 'So soon as the child is weaned, the idea of separate existence is conveyed to his tender mind; the child feels that himself is not his mother . . . he begins to infer,' &c. We doubt the fact: infant consciousness is a mysterious subject; but the use of technical words, such as *idéas*, comparison, and inference, suggests that we have mastered the difficulty. If Mr. Evans has done so, he is in advance of masters in mental philosophy.

We have received from Mr. Darling, so well known for his Theological Reading Library, the first number of a work of considerable promise and immense research, 'Cyclopædia Bibliographica.' It is a catalogue of theological writers, with a brief account of their works. A 'Cave,' modern as well as ancient, a 'Watt,' English and foreign. It seems to be most rich and explicit in recent literature, and is conducted with an especial regard to sermon-making, as in the case of a volume of sermons the text of each is given. All the pamphlets of living writers are faithfully chro-

nicked. We observe very few errors: one is, that our contemporary, Mr. Armstrong, appears twice, as of Exeter and of Tidenham. We wish the undertaking, and it is an important one, all success.

We cannot be so charitable as to impute the blunders in Mr. Stark's 'History of the Bishopric of Lincoln' (Longmans) to any other cause than that of entire ignorance of the languages which he professes to translate. There is much information in the volume; and Mr. Stark has been well assisted. But we do protest against the presumption of writing, or assuming to write, a work founded upon ancient documents without the slightest knowledge of Latin. The book is in its present state a disgrace to literature. *Ille Missa Est*, p. 64. *Ac post Romani usque perrexit et per longum spatium ibidem mansit ad legendum scrutandeque mysteriæ Dei, Sanctasque perearrit Scripturas*, p. 180. *Habitu in veta monachi insignes*, p. 185. *Juxta ritus Lindisfarnensem*, p. 215. *Peada princeps Mediterranean Anglorum*, p. 216. *Pro omni a quitonali parte Britanniae*, p. 284. Every page betrays the same ignorance.

Mr. Gresley has reprinted an Essay on 'Confession, Penance, and Abso-
lution,' by Mr. Roger Laurence, a Layman of Queen Anne's time, (Masters.) It is designed, we presume, as a supplement to this writer's able 'Essay on Confession,' which we have already commended. Mr. Gresley is of course aware that Laurence was consecrated a Bishop in one of the non-juring lines, and that he is the author of the work on 'Lay Baptism.'

'Romanism, an Apostate Church,' by Non Clericus, (Longmans,) represents a style of book which we thought we had outlived. A glance at the index will give a sufficient notice of this Florilegium: 'Romanism a curse to the world—Tractarians and Sleepy Bishops—No peace for England while a Popish Cardinal remains here—Why lags behind a certain Oxford Doctor?—Letters of Mr. Dodswell [sic] to the Oxford Doctor—Father Spencer—Father (!) Wilberforce—Rome's inculcations the dreams of a maniac,' &c. The author 'reposes confidence in our [late] noble Premier,' (p. 35.) He assures us that 'the whole Protestant population are sleeplessly alive to the future. Lord John Russell stands enwreathed on a pinnacle.' This unpleasant and unsafe position which we find that his Lordship occupied accounts more satisfactorily than any other reason we have met with for the fall of the late government.

Lieut. Burton's 'Falconry in the Valley of the Indus,' (Van Voorst,) is nicely illustrated. But though it contains some amusement, it is offensively and flippantly written, aiming at wit which it never reaches—a remarkably bad copy of 'Eothen.'

Mr. George Gorham, Scholar of Trin. Coll. Cambridge, has printed his Burney Prize Essay on 'the Eternal Duration of Future Punishment,' &c. (Deighton.) It is dedicated to Mr. Gorham, sen. of Brampford Speke, the essayist's father. That a young man has treated this subject with the learning and thought evinced by Mr. Gorham deserves great praise. It is a production full of promise.

The close of the Jubilee celebrated by the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* in Westminster Abbey, was exactly the sort of subject to call out the Bishop of Oxford's oratorical powers. In his sermon preached on that occasion, 'The Shouts and Weeping of a Day of Jubilee,' (Rivingtons,) the Bishop has sustained his reputation; but the sermon, as might have been expected, told more in delivery than in its authorized form.

To complete the case as regards the Sisters of Mercy and their establishment at Plymouth, we must call attention to Captain Sellon's affecting and positive 'Contradiction,' &c. (Masters,) founded chiefly upon documentary evidence. The recent and distressing investigation in Mr. Frynne's case is only a separate proof of the rancour with which Church principles are assailed, and, we regret to say, by the Clergy in this place.

The author of 'The Coming Man' (Green) has got hold of a vague and illiterate notion, that Scripture and the complexion of the times seem conjointly to indicate some great and serious apostasy. But whether the 'falling away' shall be developed in a system or an individual—a philosophy or an empire—he does not seem to have settled. He is clearly perplexed about the matter. Possibly some sectarian views, or, more probably, sheer ignorance, have kept him from the doctrine of a personal Antichrist. But in the case of a person well-meaning, though distressingly ignorant both of science and reason, we can only regret that an acquaintance with settled theology has been denied him.

Mr. Benson's 'Sermon on Christian Education,' preached at S. James's, Westminster, (Skeffington,) interested us for more reasons than one. It treats ably, and in excellent language, the subject of education on first principles. This is now an uncommon mode of treating the subject. Mr. Benson's sermon has somewhat the value of a noble fossil. In this way wrote—we know this from sad experience; and in this way preached—happily, this experience has been denied us—the great English preachers, Tillotson and Balguy, Atterbury and Clarke: such as were these silver-tongued orators, such is Mr. Benson. Sentence after sentence rolls on like a procession; faultless in its members, correct, uniform, and apparently capable of scansion in its arrangements. Indisputable are the thoughts, for they are elementary, undeniable, and perfectly clear. Take an example. Mr. Benson, who keeps carefully to the broad path, is illustrating the necessity of education, because Christianity itself is a matter of instruction. The fact is elementary; the inference of the plainest. Here is about the most common-place thought that could suggest itself to an educated person; and yet how sonorous is Mr. Benson's exposition of this most undeniable truth:—

'For as to the religion of the Lord Jesus, men are not, in consequence of their fallen nature, at all likely, when left to the devices of their own hearts, either to study it with such careful impartiality, or so early in life, as is necessary to make it believed with that faith which worketh by love unto obedience. In their earliest youth they *could* not do this; nor unless taught to do so, *would* they do it at any time, before the lusts of the flesh, and of the eye, and the pride of life, had pre-occupied their minds, and led them into many acts of sin. And then their sins, by teaching

'them through their conscience that God's wrath was to be feared, would 'make them averse to look upon Him; and the hold that the flesh and the 'world's vanities had obtained over their heart, would, together with the 'habit of self-indulgence, make them most unwilling to take upon them the 'yoke of so pure, so spiritual, so self-denying a course of life, as that 'which the Gospel prescribes. Because their deeds were evil, they would 'not naturally come to the light that would reprove them. Before all 'things, therefore, in point of time as well as of importance, it is necessary that, from their very infancy, the young should be taught the nature, 'truth, excellence, and duties, as well as privileges, of the Gospel.'

This is what the French would call the grand style: there is a breadth and massiveness in the ornate collocation of words which tells on the ear, if not on the intellect. This sort of sermon had its value physically, if not spiritually: it does not teach a single Christian duty, or animate to an evangelical act of sacrifice: but it soothes—it sweetens—it mollifies. It conduces to good temper, if not to good works. It asks no effort to comprehend, but it has a rich, grand, full, satisfying sound. We can quite understand the popularity of this sort of sermon. As we have said, it has a virtue of a literary kind: it dignifies platitude, and is thoroughly respectable and solemn. And we are by no means satisfied that, in the way of sermons, we have made a good exchange in the new style of empty sermons. If we are to have empty sermons, we like the old vacuity better than the new. When a preacher has nothing to say, we like his nothing clothed in good grammar, and choice language, and an elegant style. But when a preacher has nothing to say, and pours his nothing out in the vulgar, familiar style—half conversation, half cant,—of a more recent class of sermons, we must say that we look with regret to the eighteenth century preachers. They were insufferably dull, but they had a respectable well-to-do dulness. Our preachers are as dull as their predecessors, and as empty and threadbare; but then they display their vulgarity with a forward, pretentious, swaggering air. The last century preachers were like decayed gentlemen: the present popular preachers are of the avowed mendicant class. We will illustrate our meaning from a recent volume of sermons. There is no occasion to specify the writer's name, as we are engaged with a style and system, rather than with individuals: it will be enough to say that he has won high promotion, and, as it is said, mainly by his 'pulpit-powers.' Besides, the talk has been talked a thousand times.

'It may be there are some here to-day, who still cling to their own 'righteousness, and think it more glorious to be saved by their own doings 'than by the righteousness and blood of Jesus. To such I can only say, 'If you still continue thus wilfully ignorant of God's righteousness, the 'Lord of Hosts is not a crown of glory unto you, nor will be till you submit yourselves unto the righteousness of God. But, thanks be to His 'holy Name, there are others who can join with the Apostle, and say, '“God forbid that I should glory,” &c. But believe me, dear brethren, if 'any such are here, and I trust there are, it requires a deep and abiding 'conviction of the reality of these things, to enable the believer to glory 'in the cross of Christ. Oh! may He more and more unite us to Him 'self,' &c.

This is a fair example of the popular Evangelical sermon: it is the sum and substance of this class of teaching. The terms are scarcely varied; but this is the theme which is repeated week after week where 'the Gospel' is said to be exclusively preached. If the passage conveys any meaning, its obvious one is, that righteousness is wrong. For did the preacher ever meet with one single person who 'thought it glorious to be saved' by 'righteousness?' which was, in fact, even to him, never presented as righteousness, or anything else of a religious character. But would such teaching as this ever attract or direct men to religious activity? Does it convey any meaning? Is it not rather a collection of religiously-sounding phrases disguising emptiness of thought? The danger of the old sermons was, that they substituted pleasing language for direct applied personal warning: the danger of the latter is, that religious words stand in the place of religious actions.

A third class of sermon-emptinesses comes nearer home. Many Plain Sermons which we meet with are simply plain because they are without an idea. Plainness of this sort does no good. The simplest people must, if they are talked to at all, have not only articulately-sounding language addressed to them, but language which has a meaning and thought in it. A Sermon is not plain because it says nothing. English Sermons want a great reform. Orthodox or heterodox, they seem for the most part to labour under the same fault of having nothing to say.

The Convocation question has brought out a very sensible 'Letter to Mr. Walpole' from Mr. Harold Browne. (J. W. Parker.) We make one or two extracts, which will be more acceptable than our criticism:—

'3. It will perhaps be said, the Bench of Bishops can do everything that is wanted. But, in the first place, they have themselves felt the difficulty of their position, and the impossibility of agreeing in any measures of practical reform. From many causes, they cannot always have the most extensive practical knowledge of the Church. I may add, that an assembly of Bishops has never been the recognised and constitutional form of Synod in England. There is good reason to think that it was not the most primitive form. The Council held by the Apostles at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) had certainly elders as well as Apostles present at it; and I doubt not had laymen too. The earliest provincial Synods appear to have been attended by all the three orders of the clergy; and though in later times only Bishops, or Bishops and important and dignified presbyters assembled, yet, the very theory of our Reformation being, that the Church should be restored to the greatest possible likeness to the Church of the very earliest ages, it is far more accordant with our principles, that a mixed Synod should legislate for us, than that Bishops only should have a voice in our councils.'—P. 9.

'5. And still, sir, I repeat it, we want something done; something more than private efforts and private benevolence can do. Our system, adapted for the wants of the sixteenth century, and untouched since the seventeenth, has become cramped, rigid, wooden. Expansion, elasticity, life must be infused into it, or it will not work, but will only grow rustier. Without, therefore, being blind to the dangers attending Convocation,

* since, under God, there seems no other plan of improving us available, * why may we not at least be permitted to make trial of it, in trust that He * whose presence still is with us, will say, "Peace, be still!" if waves or * storms seem threatening to break over us?

* The newspapers have told us, that the inevitable tendency of Convo- * cation will be to the disruption of the Church, and the destruction of that * "compromise" upon which the very existence of the national establish- * ment has been permitted. For "compromise" allow us to read "com- * prehension," and I trust the very opposite may prove to be the truth. * Compromise is a word which sounds ominously like unfaithfulness to the * truth; and if the Church of England stands upon that, it can be no true * church, and had better fall. But I do hope and believe that, so far from * the comprehensive character of the national Church being destroyed by * Convocation, the practical reforms likely to be introduced by it will be * calculated to conciliate and comprehend, not only the two great schools * now but imperfectly united in the Anglican communion, but also some of * the bodies which unhappy circumstances have hitherto estranged from us.

* I trust and hope that, for the present at least, no effort will be made * to discuss points of doctrine, or anything materially and inevitably lead- * ing to points of doctrine. The reforms we want are practical, not doc- * trinal; for, divided as churchmen may be, all sides are happily agreed, * that the doctrines of the Prayer Book are orthodox and evangelical."—
Pp. 10, 11.

* 7. I will not trouble you, sir, with detailing the many measures which * I think Convocation might debate on, and which might tend to unity * rather than division. I will only mention, in passing, one or two more * which seem to me real and obvious necessities.

* The providing some theological and pastoral instruction for the candi- * dates for Orders is one. My impression, from somewhat considerable * experience, is, that our university education, however excellent in itself, * is insufficient to prepare men for the work of the ministry. They come * from it raw and unsuited for the task they are to engage in. The quicken- * ing of our missionary operations is another. Then, again, the putting * forth an authorized collection of hymns for public worship. The want is * felt so generally, that it needs no comment. Our Prayer Book, the * guardian of truth amongst us for three hundred years, I should hope to * see untouched and sacred; but some division of our services might very * probably be desirable; and some short and earnest forms of prayer, for * particular occasions, might be composed and authorized with much benefit. * There is one more subject, and it is a very delicate one, which I shall venture * to allude to. Individual exertions, however full of zeal and piety, have ren- * dered Protestant nunneries, Sisters of Charity, unpopular amongst us. * If such had been organized by the whole body of the Church—persons * with no strong ties of domestic duty might have given themselves for * a time, if not perpetually, to a more than commonly self-denying devo- * tion, in tending those bodily and spiritual necessities of which our great * towns present such a fearful accumulation. The Sisters of Mercy and * Wesleyan Methodism are two opposite yet concurring witnesses to the * wooden and unaccommodating condition of a synodless church. The one

tion.' (P. 7.) One is tempted to inquire whether Mr. Cole desires porkers of human 'pinguition.' In his narration Mr. Cole, challenging, sensibly enough, the cattle-show people to prove that such a process of fattening is scientific, useful, or justifiable, uses this language:—'That the 'important and serious subject-point may not be lost . . . I would admonish 'the responding defender of these procedures,' &c. (P. 14.)

We cannot concur with Mr. Paul much further than in his amiable temper and good feeling. No contribution to the cause of 'Christian Union,' on which he has printed 'Six Sermons,' delivered at Blackheath, (Rivingtons,) can be passed over without sympathy and acknowledgment. We fear, however, that compromise rather than comprehension would be the result of this writer's suggestions. He fails to see that in some very important particulars, such as the constitution of the Church, the matters of discipline are matters of doctrine, and involve the purity of faith, once for all delivered to the saints.

We can never have an excess of such works as Mr. Stretton's 'Guide to the Infirm, Sick, and Dying,' (Masters.) It is not designed as a substitute for the valued 'Visitatio Infirmorum;' but is a more condensed, and, in its introductory part, a more literary work. It has been felt that some devotions to accompany the act of confession would be useful in such a manual. Different tastes require different aids; and it is a platitude to say, that a multiplication of such aids is an incontrovertible proof of the growing inner life of the Church.

A Review of the voluminous, and, we may be pardoned for saying, occasionally tedious, 'Reports of her Majesty's School Inspectors,' has been published by Messrs. Longman, under the title of 'Extracts from the Reports,' &c. It is specifically addressed to school managers not receiving Government aid;—by way of bait, we presume.

Mr. Sandham Elly has published a reply to the work, 'Quakerism, or the Story of my Life,' which it is announced is the work of Mrs. Greer. Mr. Elly's work is to come out in parts, of which we have seen No. I., under the title, 'Ostentation, or Critical Remarks,' &c. (Dublin: Hodges and Smith.) The reply, as far as it has gone, is destructive rather of the authoress than constructive of the systems which she attacks. We make the announcement because we reviewed the original work: not, as will be remembered, without distinct strictures on the writer's tone.

The clever and condensed history of England, which we have spoken well of under its unpretending title, 'Kings of England,' (Mozleys,) has reached its fourth edition, judiciously enriched with examination questions.

A Hymnal, from the same publishers, is far above the average; and to those who can reconcile themselves to the use of unauthorized hymns, entirely to be recommended. We ask for hymns, and we suffer loss by their absence from the public service. But whether this loss is so great as the danger of countenancing bad hymns by the surrender of the principle of authority, is a mooted point, and one of no little practical difficulty.

'Landmarks of Ancient History,' (Mozleys,) is by the author, or

authoress, of 'Kings of England,' and the care and accuracy which we have commended in the former we find in the present publication. A companion on Modern History is promised.

Mr. Jameson's 'Norrisian Essay on the Analogy between the Miracles and Doctrines of Scripture,' (Macmillan,) though clever, we thought too much in the style of sermons.

The 'Anticleptic Gradus,' [Anti-Crib, as schoolboys say,] (Rivington,) is one of Mr. Kerchever Arnold's useful school-books. Its value is in its richness and precision; it omits the collection of epithets, so useful to boys and so annoying to teachers in the old manual. The old Gradus ad Parnassum, if we remember, was a Jesuit production. It is quite a reflection on the Protestant institutes that they have so long allowed it to corrupt the hope of rising England.

We have received the second edition of Professor Archer Butler's 'Sermons,' (Macmillan.)

Mr. W. Spark, 'Organist and Choir-Master, Leeds,'—we presume at St. Peter's Church,—has just published (Novello) a 'Lecture delivered before the Yorkshire Architectural Society, on Choirs and Organs, their proper Position in Churches.' It is a cheering sign to observe the general attention paid to all ecclesiological questions. Mr. Spark seems very well intentioned, but a little too much inclined to the theory that services are made for organs. His ritual views are somewhat vague, as he is a patron of antiphonal services, but stickles at their being said in the chancel. We note with interest that he singles out the position of the organ in St. Mary Magdalene, Munster-square, as the most successful example he can adduce of the position of an organ near the choir and not in gallery.

We have so frequently in these pages called attention, in various ways to the 'Irvingite' theory of the Church—we use the word in no offensive sense, but simply because we can find no other—that we have perused with great interest the recently published 'History of the Christian Church' by Dr. Thiersch, son of the Greek Grammarian. Our excellent contemporary, the 'Theological Critic,' has commenced a translation, but Mr. Arnold has been forestalled by 'Mr. Carlyle, of the Scottish Bar,' in a version of which we have received the first volume, published by Bosworth. A notice of the work, which has appeared in a newspaper, speaks of the translator's note as indicating 'Irvingism:' but Dr. Thiersch himself belongs to the same body. His History—and it is an extremely able and interesting composition—comes before us under circumstances of the greatest interest. He grapples with the difficulty which has always been urged against these views. If the Church has for seventeen centuries been suffering under the abeyance of the Apostolate, how came it, we have asked, that the Apostles made no provision for the continuance of their special and paramount office?—how came it that the Episcopate, without protest or complaint, superseded it? Did the Apostles neglect their duty—we desire to speak reverently—or did the Church conspire to prevent the transmission of their special authority?

and gifts? These are questions which have been hitherto answered or evaded in a very declamatory fashion. Dr. Thiersch, however, as an historian, could not escape the difficulty: the transition from the Apostolic to the post-Apostolic age must compel him to speak out. We turned, therefore, with the greatest anxiety to the conclusion of the first volume, where this period is discussed. We looked for documents and authorities to prove the fact; and we examined Dr. Thiersch's disquisition under the influence of the dilemma which has always presented itself to our minds as fatal to the Irvingite claims—Either the Church submitted to the greatest possible loss and fall in spiritual and hierarchical powers, by permitting the Apostolic Office to glide away without an effort to retain it, and this without a protest or murmur against this treason in the matter of a Divine ordinance; or, it was not part of the Christian economy to preserve the Apostolic Office in such distinctness as the Irvingites claim for it. Dr. Thiersch's point, therefore, must be to show that the transitional Church did know its loss, and did reclaim against it, and did something to retain the Apostolate. It is only fair to this writer—especially as he is the first to acknowledge the pinch of the argument—to let him plead his own cause. And the importance of the subject will excuse the length of our citation, which we present without comment, simply remarking that this is what we have so long looked for, the historical evidence which the 'Irvingites' have to produce for their claims.

'The time came when the rule of the Apostles was either to cease or to pass into other hands. Each individual Church, which had received a bishop from the Apostles, was protected and provided for, as long as he lived. But who was to undertake the oversight of all Churches, and of those set over them? From whom, in the event of uncertainty or discord among Bishops, could instruction in the truth, and decision as to right and wrong, go forth, in a way which should both bind and satisfy all? Who had authority to ordain elders and bishops, as the Apostles had hitherto done, and to found new bishoprics? Who had confidence to impart, with the same power and efficacy, that establishing grace and seal of confirmation, which the first believers had received from the Apostles themselves?

'The primitive Church knew nothing of the confused and confounding modern doctrine, that all ecclesiastical power rests in the multitude, and that a majority can elect, commission, and empower to all spiritual functions. There is, in all antiquity, no trace of the idea, that, when the Apostles died out, their authority devolved upon the whole body of the faithful, to be by them committed afresh to individuals. And men were then too cautious and scrupulous in holy things, to interpret any inward impulse to labour for the good of the Church, however powerful and genuine, into a divine commission, legitimate call, and adequate endowment, for such momentous functions.

'The majority of apostolic functions had been performed by apostolic delegates, as well as by Apostles. Else the Church could not have been planted in so short a time throughout the whole Roman empire. The commission of these delegates, however, was not only personal to them, but not even for life, being limited to certain occasions and services. Hence we nowhere find that, on the death of John, any survivors, who

had been used as delegates, undertook the care of the Church universal. The most of them, as Mark, Luke, and Timothy, were indeed, by later writers, called Apostles. But this was evidently in that vague use of the name which is common to this day. It is, indeed, not impossible that one or other of these men may, like Paul or Barnabas, have been actually called to and qualified for apostolic labours. Yet there is no proof whatever of this. Tradition informs us, on the contrary, that the most of these delegates afterwards laboured as bishops. Their calling, to serve the Church as a whole, fell into abeyance; and they became exclusively chief shepherds of particular Churches. For this is the difference between a bishop and a delegate; that the former is permanently set over and wedded to a particular Church, as Christ to the whole. That ancient canon which provides, that no bishop shall be taken from one Church to be set over another, save on the most special and urgent grounds, was, doubtless, founded on apostolic recollections.

Thus we see also the difference between apostles and bishops. The former are bound to no one diocese; the latter are. Each bishop has authority in Christ's stead over his own Church, to teach, exhort, bless, exercise discipline, and send out the Gospel; but not to judge other bishops, or labour in a foreign diocese. It is well known how clearly the principle, that no bishop was responsible to another, was expressed by Cyprian, as late as 256, in the Council of Carthage. And that certainly implied that none could be regarded as set over the whole Church.

If it were true, that the Apostles had appointed bishops, in consequence of feeling that they were about to depart, or in other words, had made the institution of the episcopate part of their testament to the Church, so that, by their dying directions, their power should be inherited by bishops, the usual episcopal theory would be well founded. But the fact is not so. This episcopal office was, in its essence and origin, no continuance of, or substitute for, the apostolic. The absence of Apostles was not the condition of its origin or agency. It did not come into life as apostleship died. On the contrary, it existed simultaneously with apostleship. It was instituted to co-exist with apostleship. And the condition of its right operation and development was that it should be upheld by apostleship. While John was yet in the plenitude of his authority and labours, he had seven bishops, at least, under him in Asia. Episcopacy, therefore, is not only quite a different thing from what men Episcopalians would make it, but is, in this respect, a much higher thing than that it is properly no accidental substitute or surrogate for any higher office, but an essential and distinct member in the original organization of the Church according to the will of God, with functions as definite as, yet wholly different from, those of Apostles. Apostles, bishops are not. Although they have been in fact successors of Apostles, they were not appointed to be so. . . .

Equally erroneous is the opinion that episcopal government was introduced by the surviving Apostles, after the fall of Jerusalem, to provide a basis of unity for the Church, and bind the many congregations into one corporation. The very Apostles who are supposed to have done so, were the basis of unity themselves. The Church, as an organic whole, is as old

as the apostleship itself. Bishops of equal rank; whose number under Trajan probably amounted to hundreds, were by no means the fit instrument for making or maintaining the unity of the Church-Catholic; partly because at that time an episcopal council was all but impossible; yet chiefly because, after it became possible, the bishops themselves were, each of them, one with his own flock; and the question, how the flocks were to be kept in unity, really resolved itself into the question, how the bishops were to be kept in the same. The Apostles could maintain unity, because they formed a central power, and each belonged to the whole Church, and none were identified with any one flock. When they disappeared, the Church demanded some higher substitute for their universal central authority, than an aggregate of those very local elements which needed to be kept together.

But there was no such substitute to be had at the time. Therefore, by necessary consequence, those apostolic functions which were necessary for the existence of every flock, such as confirmation of the baptized and ordination of elders, devolved on the bishop of each Church. They could not be given up, and they could not proceed from any but the highest existing ordinance, *i.e.* the episcopal. Now this took place universally, and without contradiction, save in the single case of Egypt. To explain so remarkable a fact, we must have recourse to the supposition, that, already during the life of the Apostles, and not without their approbation, the chief shepherds had been accustomed in many churches to confirm and ordain, under reservation of the subsequent apostolic sanction. We cannot imagine that John, in those years in which he alone represented the apostleship, was personally at work in all provinces of Christendom. The bishops could not suddenly have undertaken, say in the year 100, that which had been invariably done by Apostles before. An enlargement of the episcopal functions must have accompanied the gradually increasing rarity of the apostolic.

The remnants of antiquity have very little to say as to what provision the Apostles made for future generations in this matter. Paul indeed commanded Timothy (2 Tim. ii. 2;) "What thou hast heard of me, before many witnesses, commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." These words no doubt establish a succession; and a portion of apostolic authority must have passed from Paul through Timothy to these faithful men, and to their successors throughout. He must be destitute of all esteem for history and authority, who is not impressed by the proof of an uninterrupted apostolic succession. But all this says nothing as to the extent of the power which so descended through Timothy. And it is impossible, from this text alone, to justify, as normal and right, all the ecclesiastical order which the second century presents to us.

On the extinction of the apostolic office, without an adequate surrogate, Christendom was certainly neither so blind nor so indifferent, as not to feel its loss. And the New Testament itself affords to us the most accredited testimony as to the feelings of the faithful at that time. This is the addition made to the Gospel of John by his disciples after his death. (John xxi.)

* Christ had already said, before His transfiguration on the Mount,
 * "There be some of them which stand here, who shall not taste of death,
 * till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom." (Matt. xvi. 28.)
 * After His resurrection, when He appeared to the seven disciples on the
 * sea of Tiberias, He spoke a word full of mystery to John, which came to
 * the ears of the faithful, and especially occupied those among whom John
 * spent his last days. "The saying went abroad among the disciples, that
 * this disciple should not die." (John xxi. 23.) Many expected, therefore,
 * to see fulfilled in him the above prophecy given by our Lord. And, as
 * the decease of all the other apostles, the expectation became more lively,
 * that John, who had been so wonderfully preserved, should witness the
 * return of the Lord. But it happened otherwise. He also went to his
 * rest after attaining the utmost limit of man's age. He did not die as
 * a martyr—for, as the saying went, he did not need that purgation. He
 * died in Ephesus. His tomb stood outside the city. We may imagine
 * the deep impression made by his death upon the faithful. The fact was
 * then unquestionable. Was, then, the word of Christ to go unfulfilled?
 * The last chapter of John's Gospel meets this question. It is, in our
 * opinion, chiefly written by John himself. The last verses only are added
 * by the elders of Ephesus, who had the keeping of the sacred book. Christ
 * had foretold to Peter his martyrdom. Then asked Peter, concerning John,
 * "But what shall this man do?" Jesus answered, "If I will that he
 * tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me." Then comes
 * the notice by the elders, "Jesus said not," This disciple "shall not die;
 * but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" The elders,
 * therefore, give no interpretation of this remarkable saying. They merely
 * remind us of what Christ had not said. He had spoken only condi-
 * tionally; If I will. Still His language was that of one who did entertain
 * such a thought, and yet had reason to withhold a positive assertion. It
 * was no meaningless abstract assertion of a possibility which no one would
 * question. Nor was it solely a rebuke to Peter. It evidently expressed
 * a special purpose in regard to John, although its literal understanding
 * by the disciples was erroneous. As to this the elders are silent. Their
 * addition to the Gospel was intended merely to obviate the troubles
 * created by the death of the Apostle, not to give a full solution to the words
 * of Christ, which the Church should lay up in her heart.

* And it is no wonder that the above idea as to the destiny of John kept
 * its ground in the Church. It reappears in the form of two traditions,
 * that John had not really died, and that he had died and was risen again.
 * The former is reported by Augustine in his 224th Homily of the Gospel on
 * John, not as giving credence to it, but the reverse. Some, he says, assert,
 * that John descended into the grave, which he had caused to be made for
 * himself, seemed dead, and was shut in—but that he had only fallen asleep,
 * to awake at the day of judgment, and that the earth of his grave is
 * lifted by the action of his breathing. On the other hand, the Greek
 * tradition is, that God, immediately after John's death, raised him again,
 * and keeps him, that he may come in the last times to testify for the
 * truth, and along with Elias and Enoch, to overcome Antichrist. (Ephraim
 * of Theopolis ap. Photius in Myriobibl. cod. 229, p. 797 c., p. 800 b. c.

' Ed. 1653.) This idea, which stands in evident connexion with a literal understanding of two well known texts in the Apocalypse (Rev. x. 11; xi. 3), became very prevalent among the later Greeks. Nay, it is expressed in their ritual. And some Latin doctors, both of the middle ages and of later times, have inclined to it.

' Why do we cite these fancies of a period subsequent to that of which we treat? Because they were the last relics of an opinion as old as the apostolic age. And whence sprang this primitive tradition with all its offsets? From the persuasion of the Church, at the death of John, that the apostolic office should be preserved to the Church, in the last at least of those who possessed it; that the Church still needed it; that it could not be wanting at the end of the days; that it had yet the works to do, of conquering Antichrist, and of completing the yet imperfect preparation of the faithful for the coming again of Christ.

' A longing for the preservation of the peculiar blessing of apostleship is thus shown to have been felt by the primitive Church, and must have been increased by the conviction that the internal progress of the Church to perfection did not keep pace with its outward extension. Widely as the Church extended under Trajan, it betrayed a marked decay of its original light and power, to which all that still remains from that time, the writings of all the so-called apostolic fathers, bears sorrowful witness. So great is the difference between their best productions and the apostolic writings, that a glance at the respective worth and contents of the two classes of documents is sufficient to remove all uncertainty as to the boundary between canonical and uncanonical Christian literature. The subsequent experience of the Church confirms the verdict of antiquity in this matter.

' It is said that John, enfeebled by great age, being carried into the meeting of the Church, merely repeated the words, "My beloved children, love one another." (Hieron. Comm. ad Galat. c. vi. p. 100, d.) This exhortation the Church laid to heart and followed, as we may judge from the unity in which it lived during the succeeding generation, being kept together, no longer indeed by the Apostles, but by the love which they had shed abroad in it, and by the careful observance of what it had received from them. The heads of the flocks felt themselves like orphans on the death of Philip, Andrew, and John. But those orphans only kept the closer together. Faithfulness to their trust, reverence for tradition, was their motto. But, with all this, no more could be preserved than what the Church, as a whole, had really laid hold of and appropriated as a part of her life. She could never thus ripen into perfect maturity for the kingdom to come. That which she lacked, from that time forward, was the progress of that spiritual growth, which Peter, Paul, and John had both exhibited and commenced.

' Whether such a progress should again be seen, was a question on which the Church had as little light as on the duration of time which should elapse before she should reach the goal of her race. We could not expect to find any definite views among the teachers of that time as to a future revival of a proper apostolic action, unless it had been plain to them that centuries should elapse before the second coming of the Lord, and that